arXiv:1407.1206v2 [math.CA] 31 Jul 2014

On Stokes Matrices in terms of Connection Coefficients

Davide Guzzetti

SISSA, International School for Advanced Studies, Trieste, Italy.

Abstract: The classical problem of computing a complete system of Stokes multipliers of a linear system of ODEs of rank one in terms of some connection coefficients of an associated hypergeometric system of ODEs, is solved with no genericness assumptions on the residue matrix at zero, by an extension of the method of [3].

1 Introduction

In the well known paper [3], among other results, the authors compute a complete system of Stokes multipliers of a linear system of ODEs of rank one (at infinity) in terms of some connection coefficients of an associated Fuchsian (or hypergeometric) system. In [3], this is done under some assumptions on the system of rank one. One of them is that the leading term at infinity (matrix A_0 below) is diagonalizable with distinct eigenvalues. The second assumption, called *assumption (i)*, is that the diagonal entries of the residue matrix at zero (matrix A_1 below) *are not integers*.

In this paper, we are interested in extending the result above when no assumptions on A_1 are made. Moreover, we would like to do this using (an extension of) the method of [3], since it also allows to obtain results on solutions and monodromy of the associated Fuchsian system. To this end, we consider the systems of rank one (1) below, and the associated Fuchsian system (2). We are motivated by the fact that these systems appear in some applications, such as the analytic theory of semisimple Frobenius Manifolds [6], [7], [8] and the isomonodromic approach to Painlevé equations [12]. In these applications, while A_0 is diagonalizable with distinct eigenvalues[1], *assumption (i)* fails in important non generic cases.

In this paper, we compute a complete system of Stokes multipliers in terms of connection coefficients (and we define the connection coefficients) in the case when no assumptions on A_1 are made. Conversely, we express the first monodromy invariants (traces of products of monodromy matrices) of system (2) in terms of Stokes multipliers. As a side result, the monodromy of – and general relations among – higher order primitives of vector solutions of (2) are obtained. We achieve our results by an extension of the technique of [3] when A_1 is any matrix, while A_0 is still diagonalizable with distinct eigenvalues[2]. To our knowledge, such extension of the above technique was not in the literature.

As mentioned above, our result applies in particular to semisimple Frobenius manifold, where A_1 has a special form (see *Example* below), but still may violate *assumption (i)* of [3]. For this special form of A_1, the relation between Stokes matrices and connection coefficients

[1] After this paper was completed, the work [9] appeared on arXiv (April 2014), showing that for the Frobenius manifold given by the Quantum Cohomology of Grassmannians, there may be cases (depending on the dimension) when A_0 is still diagonalizable, but with some coinciding eigenvalues.

[2] This allows to consider the normal form (1).

was first computed in [8] (and in [6] and [7] when A_1 does satisfy *assumption (i)*).

From the point of view of the general theory, the assumption of distinct eigenvalues of A_0 is still restrictive, however it is enough for the applications mentioned above. To our knowledge, the case when no assumptions *at all* are made on A_0, possibly including a ramified singularity at infinity, and the system of rank one is not is normal form[3], has not yet been studied. The most general result available is in [11], where the explicit relation between Stokes-Ramis matrices and connection constants is obtained for a general system of rank one with the only assumptions of a single level equal to one. The authors of [11] achieve the result by means of the theory of summation and resurgence. In particular, our Theorem I (Theorem 1) below, which we obtain by extending the technique of [3], is contained in the results of Section 4 of [11], which are obtained by the theory of summation and resurgence.

1.1 Setting

We consider a linear system of rank one in the form

$$\frac{dY}{dz} = \left(A_0 + \frac{A_1}{z}\right) Y, \tag{1}$$

where A_0 and A_1 are $n \times n$ matrices. We assume that A_0 is diagonalizable, with distinct eigenvalues. Therefore, without loss of generality, we may assume that A_0 is already diagonal:

$$A_0 = \mathrm{diag}(\lambda_1, ..., \lambda_n), \quad \lambda_i \neq \lambda_j \text{ for } i \neq j.$$

Let us denote the diagonal entries of A_1 as follows

$$\mathrm{diag}(A_1) = (\lambda_1', ..., \lambda_n').$$

Assumption (i) of [3] is that $\lambda_1', ..., \lambda_n'$ are not integers. In this paper we drop the assumption, namely *we allow any values of* $(\lambda_1', ..., \lambda_n') \in \mathbb{C}^n$.

Solutions of (1) can be expressed in terms of convergent Laplace-type integrals [4], [10], where the integrands are solutions of the Fuchsian system

$$(A_0 - \lambda)\frac{d\Psi}{d\lambda} = (A_1 + I)\Psi, \qquad I := \text{ identity matrix} \tag{2}$$

Indeed, let $\vec{\Psi}(\lambda)$ be a vector valued function and define

$$\vec{Y}(z) = \int_\gamma e^{\lambda z}\vec{\Psi}(\lambda)d\lambda,$$

where γ is a suitable path. Substituting in (1), we obtain

$$z\int_\gamma \lambda e^{\lambda z}\vec{\Psi}(\lambda)d\lambda = (zA_0 + A_1)\int_\gamma e^{\lambda z}\vec{\Psi}(\lambda)d\lambda.$$

[3] If the eigenvalues are not distinct, or A_0 is not irreducible, a Birkhoff normal form may not be achieved. See [1] for a review

This implies that

$$A_1 \int_\gamma e^{\lambda z}\vec{\Psi}(\lambda)d\lambda = \int_\gamma \frac{d(e^{\lambda z})}{d\lambda}\ (\lambda - A_0)\vec{\Psi}(\lambda)d\lambda =$$

$$= e^{\lambda z}(\lambda - A_0)\vec{\Psi}(\lambda)\Big|_\gamma - \int_\gamma e^{\lambda z}\left[(\lambda - A_0)\frac{d\vec{\Psi}(\lambda)}{d\lambda} + \vec{\Psi}(\lambda)\right]d\lambda.$$

If γ is such that $e^{\lambda z}(\lambda - A_0)\vec{\Psi}(\lambda)\Big|_\gamma = 0$, and if the function $\vec{\Psi}(\lambda)$ solves (2), then $\vec{Y}(z)$ solves (1).

In order to generalize the result of [3], following an analogous method, we need to characterize the solutions of (2) without assumptions on A_1. System (2) can be rewritten as

$$\frac{d\Psi}{d\lambda} = \sum_{k=1}^{n} \frac{B_k}{\lambda - \lambda_k}\Psi, \qquad B_k := -E_k(A_1 + I), \quad 1 \le k \le n, \tag{3}$$

where E_k is a $n \times n$ matrix with entries $(E_k)_{kk} = 1$ and $(E_k)_{ij} = 0$ otherwise. A fundamental matrix solution of (3) is multivalued in $\mathbb{C}\backslash\{\lambda_1, ..., \lambda_n\}$. Let $\mathcal{U}$ be the universal covering of $\mathbb{C}\backslash\{\lambda_1, ..., \lambda_n\}$. Following [3], we fix parallel cuts L_k, *oriented* from λ_k to ∞

$$L_k := \{\lambda \in \mathcal{U} \mid \arg(\lambda - \lambda_k) = \eta\}, \qquad 1 \le k \le n,$$

where

$$\eta \in \mathbb{R}, \qquad \eta \neq \arg(\lambda_j - \lambda_k) \bmod 2\pi, \qquad \text{for all } 1 \le j, k \le n.$$

The above condition means that a cut L_k does not contain another pole λ_j, $j \neq k$. See figure 1. Such values of η are called *admissible*. Wee fix the branch $\ln(\lambda - \lambda_k) = \ln|\lambda - \lambda_k| + i\eta - 0$ when $\arg(\lambda - \lambda_k) = \eta - 0$. The complex plane (as a sheet of $\mathcal{U}$) with these cuts and choices of the branches of logarithm is denoted

$$\mathcal{P}_\eta := \{\lambda \in \mathcal{U} \mid \eta - 2\pi < \arg(\lambda - \lambda_k) < \eta, \ \ 1 \le k \le n\}.$$

We prove in Section 2 that system (2), depending on the values of $(\lambda_1', ..., \lambda_n') \in \mathbb{C}^n$, admits a matrix solution (not necessarily fundamental) of the form:

$$\Psi(\lambda) = \Big[\vec{\Psi}_1(\lambda) \mid \cdots \mid \vec{\Psi}_n(\lambda)\Big], \qquad \lambda \in \mathcal{P}_\eta$$

whose columns $\vec{\Psi}_k(\lambda)$, $k = 1, ..., n$, have the following behaviours in a neighbourhood of λ_k:

$$\vec{\Psi}_k(\lambda) = \begin{cases} \left(\Gamma(\lambda_k' + 1)\vec{e}_k + \sum_{l\ge 1} \vec{b}_l^{\,(k)}(\lambda - \lambda_k)^l\right)\ (\lambda - \lambda_k)^{-\lambda_k' - 1} & \lambda_k' \notin \mathbb{Z} \\ \left(\frac{(-1)^{N_k}}{(-N_k - 1)!}\vec{e}_k + \sum_{l\ge 1} \vec{b}_l^{\,(k)}(\lambda - \lambda_k)^l\right)(\lambda - \lambda_k)^{-N_k - 1} & \lambda_k' = N_k \in \mathbb{Z}_- \\ \vec{d}_0^{\,(k)} + \sum_{l\ge 1} \vec{d}_l^{\,(k)}(\lambda - \lambda_k)^l & \lambda_k' \in \mathbb{N} \end{cases}$$

$$\mathbb{N} = \{0, 1, 2, ...\} \ \text{ integers}, \qquad \mathbb{Z}_- = \{-1, -2, -3, ...\} \ \text{ negative integers},$$



Figure 1: The poles λ_j, $1 \le j \le n$ of system (2), and branch cuts L_j.

$$\vec{e}_k = \ k\text{-th unit column vector in } \mathbb{C}^n.$$

The Taylor series in $(\lambda - \lambda_k)$ converge in a neighbourhood of λ_k. The coefficients $\vec{b}_l^{\,(k)} \in \mathbb{C}^n$ are uniquely determined by the choice of the normalizations $\Gamma(\lambda_k' + 1)\vec{e}_k$ and $\frac{(-1)^{N_k}}{(-N_k-1)!}\vec{e}_k$. The coefficients $\vec{d}_l^{\,(k)} \in \mathbb{C}^n$ are uniquely determined by the existence of a singular vector solution at λ_k with behaviour

$$\vec{\Psi}_k(\lambda)\ln(\lambda - \lambda_k) + \frac{N_k!\vec{e}_k + O(\lambda - \lambda_k)}{(\lambda - \lambda_k)^{N_k+1}}, \qquad N_k = \lambda_k' \in \mathbb{N}.$$

We will show (Definition 1, Section 2) that there exist unique *connection coefficients* $c_{jk} \in \mathbb{C}$ such that, in a neighbourhood of any $\lambda_j \ne \lambda_k$:

$$\vec{\Psi}_k(\lambda) = \begin{cases} \vec{\Psi}_j(\lambda)c_{jk} + \mathrm{reg}(\lambda - \lambda_j), & \lambda_j' \notin \mathbb{Z} \\ \vec{\Psi}_j(\lambda)\ln(\lambda - \lambda_j)c_{jk} + \mathrm{reg}(\lambda - \lambda_j), & \lambda_j' \in \mathbb{Z}_- \\ \left(\vec{\Psi}_j(\lambda)\ln(\lambda - \lambda_j) + \frac{P_{N_j}^{(j)}(\lambda)}{(\lambda-\lambda_j)^{N_j+1}}\right)c_{jk} + \mathrm{reg}(\lambda - \lambda_j), & \lambda_j' = N_j \in \mathbb{N} \end{cases} \tag{4}$$

Here $P_{N_j}^{(j)}$ is a polynomial in $(\lambda - \lambda_j)$ of degree N_j, and $\mathrm{reg}(\lambda - \lambda_j)$ is a vector function analytic (regular) in a neighbourhood of λ_j. We will characterize the connection coefficients and the solutions $\vec{\Psi}_k$ in Section 2. In particular,

$$c_{kk} = 1 \quad \text{if } \lambda_k' \notin \mathbb{Z}, \qquad c_{kk} = 0 \quad \text{if } \lambda_k' \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

Let $\tau = 3\pi/2 - \eta$. There are three unique fundamental matrices of (1), say $Y_I(z)$, $Y_{II}(z)$ and $Y_{III}(z)$, with canonical asymptotic behaviour $(I + O(1/z))\exp\{A_0 z + A_1 \ln z\}$ in the three sectors $\{z \mid \tau - \pi \le \arg z \le \tau\}$, $\{z \mid \tau \le \arg z \le \tau + \pi\}$ and $\{z \mid \tau + \pi \le \arg z \le \tau + 2\pi\}$ respectively. They are related by two Stokes matrices S_+ and S_- such that

$$Y_{II}(z) = Y_I(z)S_+, \quad \arg z = \tau; \qquad Y_{III}(z) = Y_{II}(z)S_-, \quad \arg z = \tau + \pi.$$

Introduce in $\{1,2,...,n\}$ the partial ordering $\prec$ given by

$$j \prec k \iff \Re(z(\lambda_j - \lambda_k)) < 0 \text{ for } \arg z = \tau, \qquad i \neq j, \quad i,j \in \{1,...,n\}.$$

1.2 Main Results

Proposition I (Proposition 2): *Let the branch cuts $L_1,...,L_n$ be fixed. The monodromy matrix $M_k = (m_{ij}^{(k)})_{i,j=1...n}$ of $\Psi(\lambda)$ representing a small loop in anticlockwise direction around λ_k, not encircling all the other points $\lambda_j \neq \lambda_k$, $j = 1,...,n$ is:*

$$m_{jj}^{(k)} = 1 \quad 1 \leq j \leq n, \quad j \neq k; \qquad m_{kk}^{(k)} = e^{-2\pi i \lambda_k'};$$

$$m_{kj}^{(k)} = \alpha_k \; c_{kj}, \quad 1 \leq j \leq n, \quad j \neq k; \qquad m_{ij}^{(k)} = 0 \quad \textit{otherwise.}$$

where

$$\begin{cases} \alpha_k := (e^{-2\pi i \lambda_k'} - 1), & \textit{if } \lambda_k' \notin \mathbb{Z}, \\ \\ \alpha_k := 2\pi i, & \textit{if } \lambda_k' \in \mathbb{Z}. \end{cases}$$

Equivalently, the effect of the loop on $\Psi(\lambda)$ is

$$\vec{\Psi}_k(\lambda) \longmapsto e^{-2\pi i \lambda_k'} \vec{\Psi}_k(\lambda); \qquad \vec{\Psi}_j(\lambda) \longmapsto \vec{\Psi}_j(\lambda) + \alpha_k c_{kj} \vec{\Psi}_k(\lambda), \quad j \neq k.$$

Theorem I (Theorem 1): *The Stokes matrices of system (1) are given in terms of the connection coefficients c_{jk} of system (2) according to the formulae*

$$[S_+]_{jk} = \begin{cases} e^{2\pi i \lambda_k'} \alpha_k \; c_{jk} & \textit{for } j \prec k, \\ \\ 1 & \textit{for } j = k, \\ \\ 0 & \textit{for } j \succ k, \end{cases} \qquad [S_-^{-1}]_{jk} = \begin{cases} 0 & \textit{for } j \prec k, \\ \\ 1 & \textit{for } j = k, \\ \\ -e^{2\pi i (\lambda_k' - \lambda_j')} \alpha_k \; c_{jk} & \textit{for } j \succ k. \end{cases}$$

Corollary I (Corollary 6): *The following equalities hold for the monodromy matrices of $\Psi(\lambda)$:*

$$\mathrm{Tr}(M_k) = n - 1 + e^{-2\pi i \lambda_k'}$$

$$\mathrm{Tr}(M_j M_k) = \begin{cases} n - 2 + e^{-2\pi i \lambda_j'} + e^{-2\pi i \lambda_k'} - e^{-2\pi i \lambda_j'} \; [S_+]_{jk} [S_-^{-1}]_{kj} & \textit{if } j \prec k, \\ \\ n - 2 + e^{-2\pi i \lambda_j'} + e^{-2\pi i \lambda_k'} - e^{-2\pi i \lambda_k'} \; [S_-^{-1}]_{jk} [S_+]_{kj} & \textit{if } j \succ k. \end{cases}$$

Proposition II (Propositions 3 and 4): *If A_1 has no integer eigenvalues, then $\Psi(\lambda)$ is a fundamental matrix and $M_1,...,M_n$ generate the monodromy group of system (2). Moreover, the matrix $C := (c_{jk})$ is invertible if and only if A_1 has no integer eigenvalues.*

Remark: There are cases when A_1 has integer eigenvalues and Ψ is fundamental. We prove that in these cases, necessarily, some $\lambda_k' \in \mathbb{Z}$.

Example: When system (1) is associated to Frobenius Manifolds [6], [7], [8], the matrix A_1 has a special form, namely it is expressed in terms of a skew symmetric matrix V as follows:

$$A_1 = V - \left(\frac{1}{2} + \nu\right) I, \qquad \nu \in \mathbb{C}, \qquad V^T = -V$$

We show how our general results above apply to this case. Since $\lambda'_k = -\nu - \frac{1}{2}$, $1 \leq k \leq n$, it follows that

$$\alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = \cdots = \alpha_n = \alpha, \quad \text{where} \quad \alpha := \begin{cases} -(1 + e^{2\pi i \nu}) & \text{if } \nu \notin \mathbb{Z} + \frac{1}{2}, \\ 2\pi i & \text{if } \nu \in \mathbb{Z} + \frac{1}{2}. \end{cases}$$

From Theorem I above (and the fact that the $c_{kk} = 0$ when $\lambda'_k \in \mathbb{Z}$), we deduce that

$$e^{2\pi i \nu} S_+ + S_-^{-1} = -\alpha C, \qquad \text{where } \; C := (c_{ij}).$$

Since V is a $n \times n$ skew symmetric matrix, it can be easily verified that

$$S_+^T = S_-^{-1}.$$

Thus

$$e^{2\pi i \nu} S_+ + S_+^T = -\alpha C. \tag{5}$$

The above, and Proposition II, allow us to conclude that if $e^{2\pi i \nu} S_+ + S_+^T$ is invertible, then A_1 has no integer eigenvalues and so $\Psi(\lambda)$ is invertible. This is part of the first assertion of Theorem 4.3 of [8], namely if

$$\det(e^{2\pi i \nu} S_+ + S_+^T) \neq 0,$$

then system (2) has n linearly independent solutions $\vec{\Psi}_1, ..., \vec{\Psi}_n$. From (5) and Proposition I, it follows that for an anticlockwise loop around λ_i, the monodromy of the above solutions is

$$\vec{\Psi}_i \longmapsto -e^{2\pi i \nu} \vec{\Psi}_i, \qquad \vec{\Psi}_j \longmapsto \vec{\Psi}_j - e^{i\pi\nu} \left(e^{i\pi\nu} S_+ + e^{-i\pi\nu} S_+^T\right)_{ij} \vec{\Psi}_i, \quad j \neq i.$$

The above is formula (4.11) in Theorem 4.3 of [8]. □

The paper is organized as follows:

– Section 2: We construct vector solutions $\vec{\Psi}_k(\lambda)$, $1 \leq k \leq n$, to system (2)-(3), and define the connection coefficient, with no assumptions on A_1.

– Section 3: We construct two matrix solutions Ψ and Ψ^* to system (2)-(3), discuss when they are fundamental, and compute their monodromy in terms of connection coefficients (with no assumptions on A_1).

– Section 4: We discuss the dependence of Ψ and Ψ^* on the choice of the branch cuts L_1, ..., L_n (with no assumptions on A_1).

– Section 5: We define a complete set of Stokes multipliers for (1). We write the columns of the fundamental matrix of system (1), having canonical asymptotics in a wide sector, as Laplace integrals of the $\vec{\Psi}_k$, $1 \leq k \leq n$, and express the latter in terms of the the coefficients of the former asymptotics.

– Section 6: We state the main theorem (Theorem 1), which gives Stokes matrices and Stokes factors of (1) in terms of connection coefficients of (2)-(3), and express the first monodromy invariants of system (2)-(3) in terms of Stokes matrices (Corollary 6).

– Section 7: we prove Theorem 1, and find relations and monodromy for q-primitives of vector solutions of (2)-(3).

– In the Appendix, we prove some propositions which generalize similar results of [3] when no assumptions on A_1 are made.

2 Local Solutions of System (3) (equivalently, of (2))

The matrix B_k in system (3) has zero entries, except for the k-th row. Indeed, letting $A_1 = (A_{ij})_{i,j=1,...,n}$, a straightforward computation yields

$$B_k = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & & 0 & & 0 \\ \vdots & & \vdots & & \vdots \\ -A_{k1} & \cdots -A_{k,k-1} & -\lambda'_k - 1 & -A_{k,k+1} \cdots & -A_{kn} \\ \vdots & & \vdots & & \vdots \\ 0 & & 0 & & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

A fundamental matrix solution of (3) is multivalued in $\mathbb{C}\backslash\{\lambda_1, ..., \lambda_n\}$ and single-valued in $\mathcal{P}_\eta$, for and admissible direction η. If λ is in a neighbourhood of a λ_k not containing the other poles, there exists a fundamental matrix solution

$$\Psi^{(k)}(\lambda) = [\vec{\Psi}_1^{(k)}(\lambda) \mid \cdots \mid \vec{\Psi}_n^{(k)}(\lambda)],$$

which can be computed in a standard way, depending on the value of λ'_k (see [13]). In [3], only the case $\lambda'_k \notin \mathbb{Z}$ is considered (point 1) below). Here we need to analyse also the case $\lambda'_k \in \mathbb{Z}$ (points 2), 3) and 4) below).

1) [Generic Case, as in [3]]. If $\lambda'_k \notin \mathbb{Z}$, then B_k is diagonalizable, with diagonal form

$$T^{(k)} = [G^{(k)}]^{-1} B_k G^{(k)} = \mathrm{diag}(0, ..., 0, -\lambda'_k - 1, 0, ..., 0),$$

where the non zero entry is at the k-th position. The k-th column of the diagonalizing matrix $G^{(k)}$ can be chosen to be a multiple of the k-th vector $\vec{e}_k$ of the canonical basis of $\mathbb{C}^n$. As in [3] we choose normalization $\Gamma(\lambda'_k + 1)\vec{e}_k$. Any other column of $G^{(k)}$ has two non zero entries. A fundamental matrix is then

$$\Psi^{(k)}(\lambda) = G^{(k)}(I + O(\lambda - \lambda_k))(\lambda - \lambda_k)^{T^{(k)}},$$

Here $O(\lambda - \lambda_k)$ is a matrix valued Taylor series, converging in the neighbourhood of λ_k and vanishing as $\lambda \to \lambda_k$. Write

$$G^{(k)}(I + O(\lambda - \lambda_k)) = [\vec{\psi}_1^{(k)}(\lambda)| \ ... \ |\vec{\psi}_n^{(k)}(\lambda)],$$

where the columns $\vec{\psi}_j^{(k)}(\lambda)$ are analytic functions in a neighbourhood of λ_k, expanded in convergent Taylor series. Then:

$$\Psi^{(k)}(\lambda) = \Big[\vec{\psi}_1^{(k)}(\lambda) \mid ... \mid \vec{\psi}_{k-1}^{(k)}(\lambda) \mid \vec{\psi}_k^{(k)}(\lambda)(\lambda - \lambda_k)^{-\lambda'_k - 1} \mid \vec{\psi}_{k+1}^{(k)}(\lambda) \mid ... \mid \vec{\psi}_n^{(k)}(\lambda)\Big].$$

The columns are n independent vector solutions, $n-1$ being analytic and the k-th singular. We assign the symbol $\vec{\Psi}_k$ to the singular solution, as follows

$$\boxed{\vec{\Psi}_k(\lambda) := \vec{\Psi}_k^{(k)}(\lambda) = \vec{\psi}_k^{(k)}(\lambda)(\lambda-\lambda_k)^{-\lambda_k'-1}.} \tag{6}$$

where

$$\boxed{\vec{\psi}_k^{(k)}(\lambda) = \Gamma(\lambda_k'+1)\vec{e}_k + \textstyle\sum_{l\geq 1} \vec{b}_l^{\,(k)}(\lambda-\lambda_k)^l.}$$

The vector coefficients $\vec{b}_l^{(k)}$ can be computed rationally from the matrix coefficients B_l's of system (3). See [13]. The above $\vec{\Psi}_k$ is called *associated function* in [3].

2) [Jordan Case]. If $\lambda_k' = -1$, then B_k has Jordan form

$$J^{(k)} = [G^{(k)}]^{-1}B_kG^{(k)} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & & & & & \\ & \ddots & & & & \\ & & 0 & 1 & & \\ & & 0 & 0 & & \\ & & & & \ddots & \\ & & & & & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Entry 1 is at row $(k-1)$ and column k. The column $k-1$ of $G^{(k)}$ can be normalized to be $-\vec{e}_k$. The k-th column only has a non zero entry, and the other columns have two non zero entries. There exist a fundamental matrix solution with local representation

$$\begin{aligned}\Psi^{(k)}(\lambda) &= G^{(k)}(I+O(\lambda-\lambda_k))(\lambda-\lambda_k)^{J^{(k)}} \\ &= \left[\vec{\psi}_1^{(k)}(\lambda)|\ ...\ |\vec{\psi}_n^{(k)}(\lambda)\right](\lambda-\lambda_k)^{J^{(k)}} \\ = \left[\vec{\psi}_1^{(k)}(\lambda)\ |\ ...\ |\ \vec{\psi}_{k-1}^{(k)}(\lambda)\ |\ \vec{\psi}_{k-1}^{(k)}(\lambda)\ln(\lambda-\lambda_k) + \vec{\psi}_k^{(k)}(\lambda)\ |\ \vec{\psi}_{k+1}^{(k)}(\lambda)\ |\ ...\ |\ \vec{\psi}_n^{(k)}(\lambda)\right],\end{aligned}$$

where the columns $\vec{\psi}_j^{(k)}$ are analytic in a neighbourhood of λ_k. The columns are n independent vector solutions, $n-1$ being analytic and the k-th singular. We assign the symbol $\vec{\Psi}_k$ to the non-singular factor of $\ln(\lambda-\lambda_k)$, as follows

$$\boxed{\vec{\Psi}_k(\lambda) := \vec{\psi}_{k-1}^{(k)}(\lambda) = -\vec{e}_k + \textstyle\sum_{l\geq 1} \vec{b}_l^{\,(k)}(\lambda-\lambda_k)^l.} \tag{7}$$

Note that this is a solution of (3). Then, the k-th column of $\Psi^{(k)}$ is

$$\boxed{\vec{\Psi}_k^{(k)}(\lambda) = \vec{\Psi}_k(\lambda)\ln(\lambda-\lambda_k) + \mathrm{reg}(\lambda-\lambda_k),} \tag{8}$$

where $\mathrm{reg}(\lambda-\lambda_k)$ means an analytic (vector) function in a neighbourhood of λ_k.

3) [First Resonant Case] If $\lambda_k' = N_k \geq 0$ is integer, then B_k is diagonalizable as in case 1), but now a fundamental solution has the form

$$\Psi^{(k)}(\lambda) = G^{(k)}(I + O(\lambda-\lambda_k))\ (\lambda-\lambda_k)^{T^{(k)}}\ (\lambda-\lambda_k)^{R^{(k)}},$$

where $R^{(k)}$ is a matrix with zero entries expect for $R^{(k)}_{jk}$, $j = 1,..,n$, and $j \neq k$, because $(Eigen(B_k))_j - Eigen(B_k))_k = N_k + 1 > 0$. Thus, only the k-th column of $R^{(k)}$ may be non zero. Let $r^{(k)}_j := R^{(k)}_{jk}$, so that the k-th column is

$$\vec{r}^{\,(k)} = (r^{(k)}_1, ..., r^{(k)}_{k-1}, 0, r^{(k)}_{k+1}, ..., r^{(k)}_n)^T,$$

where T means transposition. The entries $r^{(k)}_j$ are computed as rational functions of the entries of the matrices B_l, $l = 1,..,n$ (see [13]). From the above, it follows that

$$\Psi^{(k)}(\lambda) = \left[\vec{\psi}^{(k)}_1(\lambda)| \ ... \ |\vec{\psi}^{(k)}_n(\lambda)\right]\ (\lambda-\lambda_k)^{T^{(k)}}\ (I + R^{(k)}\ln(\lambda-\lambda_k)) =$$

$$= \left[\vec{\psi}^{(k)}_1(\lambda) \mid ... \mid \vec{\psi}^{(k)}_{k-1}(\lambda) \mid \Psi^{(k)}_k(\lambda) \mid \vec{\psi}^{(k)}_{k+1}(\lambda) \mid ... \mid \vec{\psi}^{(k)}_n(\lambda)\right],$$

where

$$\Psi^{(k)}_k(\lambda) = \left\{\sum_{j\neq k} r^{(k)}_j \vec{\psi}^{(k)}_j(\lambda)\right\}\ln(\lambda-\lambda_k) + \frac{\vec{\psi}^{(k)}_k(\lambda)}{(\lambda-\lambda_k)^{N_k+1}},$$

$$\vec{\psi}^{(k)}_k(\lambda) = N_k!\ \vec{e}_k + O(\lambda-\lambda_k),$$

the factor $N_k!$ coming from a chosen normalization of $G^{(k)}$. The columns are n independent vector solutions, $n-1$ being analytic (i.e. the $\vec{\psi}_j^{\,(k)}$, $j \neq k$) and the k-th singular (i.e. $\Psi^{(k)}_k$) . We assign the symbol $\vec{\Psi}_k$ to the non-singular factor of $\ln(\lambda-\lambda_k)$ as follows

$$\boxed{\vec{\Psi}_k(\lambda) := \textstyle\sum_{j\neq k} r^{(k)}_j \vec{\psi}^{(k)}_j(\lambda) = \sum_{l\geq 0} \vec{d}_l^{\,(k)}(\lambda-\lambda_k)^l.}$$

Note that this is a solution of (3), being linear combination of regular solutions $\vec{\psi}^{(k)}_j$. Special cases can occur when $\vec{r}^{\,(k)} = 0$, so that $\vec{\Psi}_k(\lambda) \equiv 0$. We conclude that the k-th column of $\Psi^{(k)}$ is

$$\boxed{\vec{\Psi}^{(k)}_k(\lambda) = \vec{\Psi}_k(\lambda)\ln(\lambda-\lambda_k) + \frac{P^{(k)}_{N_k}(\lambda)}{(\lambda-\lambda_k)^{N_k+1}} + \mathrm{reg}(\lambda-\lambda_k),} \tag{9}$$

where

$$\boxed{P^{(k)}_{N_k}(\lambda) = N_k!\ \vec{e}_k + \textstyle\sum_{l=0}^{N_k} \vec{b}_l^{\,(k)}(\lambda-\lambda_k)^l,}$$

represents the first N_k+1 terms in the expansion of $\vec{\psi}_k^{(k)}$. The vector coefficients $\vec{b}_l^{(k)}$ are computed rationally from the coefficients of (3). The solution (9) is not uniquely determined, because we can add a linear combination of regular solutions $\vec{\psi}_j^{(k)}$, but the singular part is uniquely determined by the normalization of $P^{(k)}(\lambda)$. Consequently, also $\vec{\Psi}_k(\lambda)$ is uniquely determined.

4) [Second Resonant Case] If $\lambda'_k = N_k \leq -2$ is integer, then B_k is diagonalizable as in case 1), but now a fundamental solution has the form

$$\Psi^{(k)}(\lambda) = G^{(k)}(I + O(\lambda - \lambda_k))\ (\lambda - \lambda_k)^{T^{(k)}}\ (\lambda - \lambda_k)^{R^{(k)}},$$

where $R^{(k)}$ is a matrix with zero entries expect for $R^{(k)}_{kj}$, $j = 1, .., n$, and $j \neq k$, because $(Eigen(B_k))_k - Eigen(B_k))_j = -N_k - 1 > 0$. Thus, only the k-th row of $R^{(k)}$ may be non zero. Let $r_j^{(k)} := R^{(k)}_{kj}$, so that the k-th row is

$$\underline{r}^{(k)} = [r_1^{(k)}, ..., r_{k-1}^{(k)}, 0, r_{k+1}^{(k)}, ..., r_n^{(k)}],$$

where the entries $r_j^{(k)}$ are computed as rational functions of the entries if the matrices B_l, $l = 1, .., n$ (see [13]). Thus,

$$\Psi^{(k)}(\lambda) = \left[\vec{\psi}_1^{(k)}(\lambda)| \ ... \ |\vec{\psi}_n^{(k)}(\lambda)\right]\ (\lambda - \lambda_k)^{T^{(k)}}\ \ (I + R^{(k)} \ln(\lambda - \lambda_k))$$

where the $\vec{\psi}_j{}^{(k)}(\lambda)$ are analytic and Taylor expanded in a neighbourhood of λ_k. The columns of the above matrix are

$$\vec{\Psi}_j^{(k)}(\lambda) = r_j^{(k)} \vec{\psi}_k^{(k)}(\lambda)\ (\lambda - \lambda_k)^{-N_k - 1} \ln(\lambda - \lambda_k) + \vec{\psi}_j^{(k)}(\lambda), \qquad j = 1, ..., n, \ \ j \neq k,$$

$$\vec{\Psi}_k^{(k)}(\lambda) = \vec{\psi}_k^{(k)}(\lambda)\ (\lambda - \lambda_k)^{-N_k - 1}.$$

There are at most $n-1$ independent singular solutions at λ_k, and at least one analytic solution $\vec{\Psi}_k^{(k)}$. In special cases, it may happen that $\underline{r}^{(k)} = 0$, so that there are n independent solutions analytic at λ_k. We show below (Lemma 1) that in fact we can always find $n-1$ independent solutions analytic at λ_k, whatever $\underline{r}^{(k)}$ is.
We assign the symbol $\vec{\Psi}_k$ to the k^{th} column:

$$\boxed{\vec{\Psi}_k(\lambda) := \vec{\Psi}_k^{(k)}(\lambda) = \vec{\psi}_k^{(k)}(\lambda)\ (\lambda - \lambda_k)^{-N_k - 1}}$$

with normalization

$$\boxed{\vec{\psi}_k^{(k)}(\lambda) = \frac{(-1)^{N_k}}{(-N_k - 1)!} \vec{e}_k + \sum_{l \geq 1} b_l^{(k)} (\lambda - \lambda_k)^l} \tag{10}$$

where the convergent Taylor series has coefficients determined rationally by the matrices B_l's of (3). The logarithmic solutions are rewritten as

$$\vec{\Psi}_j^{(k)}(\lambda) = r_j^{(k)} \vec{\Psi}_k(\lambda) \ln(\lambda - \lambda_k) + \vec{\psi}_j^{(k)}(\lambda), \qquad j \neq k, \ \ 1 \leq j \leq n.$$

It follows that if at least one $r_j^{(k)} \neq 0$, we can pick up the singular solutions

$$\boxed{\vec{\Psi}_k(\lambda)\ln(\lambda-\lambda_k)+\mathrm{reg}(\lambda-\lambda_k)}, \tag{11}$$

The regular part is an arbitrary linear combination of the $\vec{\psi}_j^{(k)}$'s, $1 \leq j \leq n$, $j \neq k$. The singular part is determined uniquely by the normalization (10).

Lemma 1 *Let λ_k' be an integer $N_k \leq -2$. If $\underline{r}^{(k)} = 0$, system (3) has n independent solutions analytic at λ_k. . If $\underline{r}^{(k)} \neq 0$, system (3) has n independent solutions, of which $n-1$ are analytic and one is log-singular at λ_k.*

Proof: Let $0 \leq s \leq n-1$ be the number of non zero values $r_{i_1}, ..., r_{i_s}$. If $\underline{r}^{(k)} = 0$, then $s = 0$ and by the preceding construction there exist n independent solutions

$$\vec{\psi}_1^{(k)},\ \dots,\vec{\psi}_{k-1}^{(k)},\ \vec{\Psi}_k,\ \vec{\psi}_{k+1}^{(k)},\ \dots,\vec{\psi}_n^{(k)}.$$

If $s > 0$, then consider the following partition of $\{1, 2, ..., k-1, k+1, ..., n\}$:

$$\{i_1, i_2, ..., i_s\} \cap \{j_1, j_2, ..., j_l\} = \emptyset, \qquad l + s = n - 1,$$

$$\{i_1, i_2, ..., i_s\} \cup \{j_1, j_2, ..., j_l\} = \{1, 2, ..., k-1, k+1, ..., n\}.$$

There are s singular (at λ_k) solutions

$$\vec{\Psi}_{i_1}^{(k)},\ \vec{\Psi}_{i_2}^{(k)},\ \dots,\ \vec{\Psi}_{i_s}^{(k)},$$

and the remaining analytic (at λ_k) solutions

$$\vec{\psi}_{j_1}^{(k)},\ \vec{\psi}_{j_2}^{(k)},\ \dots,\ \vec{\psi}_{j_l}^{(k)}$$

We construct another set of $s-1$ independent analytic (at λ_k) solutions:

$$\varphi_{i_1}^{(k)} := \frac{1}{r_{i_1}^{(k)}}\vec{\Psi}_{i_1}^{(k)} - \frac{1}{r_{i_s}^{(k)}}\vec{\Psi}_{i_s}^{(k)},$$

$$\varphi_{i_2}^{(k)} := \frac{1}{r_{i_2}^{(k)}}\vec{\Psi}_{i_2}^{(k)} - \frac{1}{r_{i_s}^{(k)}}\vec{\Psi}_{i_s}^{(k)},$$

$$\vdots$$

$$\varphi_{i_{s-1}}^{(k)} := \frac{1}{r_{i_{s-1}}^{(k)}}\vec{\Psi}_{i_{s-1}}^{(k)} - \frac{1}{r_{i_s}^{(k)}}\vec{\Psi}_{i_s}^{(k)},$$

It follows that there always exist $n-1$ linearly independent vector solution which are analytic at λ_k, namely

$$\varphi_{i_1},\ \dots,\varphi_{i_{s-1}};\quad \vec{\psi}_{j_1}^{(k)},\ \vec{\psi}_{j_2}^{(k)},\ \dots,\ \vec{\psi}_{j_l}^{(k)};\quad \vec{\Psi}_k,$$

Moreover, there also exists the singular solution $\vec{\Psi}_k(\lambda)\ln(\lambda-\lambda_k)+\mathrm{reg}(\lambda-\lambda_k)$. This proves the lemma. $\square$.

Conclusion: The four cases above are summarized below (letting $0!=1$):

$$\vec{\Psi}_k(\lambda)=\begin{cases}(\Gamma(\lambda_k'+1)\vec{e}_k+O(\lambda-\lambda_k))\ (\lambda-\lambda_k)^{-\lambda_k'-1} & \text{Case 1): } \lambda_k'\notin\mathbb{Z}.\\ \left(\frac{(-1)^{N_k}}{(-N_k-1)!}\vec{e}_k+O(\lambda-\lambda_k)\right)(\lambda-\lambda_k)^{-N_k-1} & \text{Case 2), 4): } \lambda_k'=N_k\in\mathbb{Z}_-.\\ \sum_{j\neq k}r_j^{(k)}\psi_j^{(k)}(\lambda)=\mathrm{reg}(\lambda-\lambda_k) & \text{Case 3): } \lambda_k'\in\mathbb{N}.\end{cases}\tag{12}$$

Moreover, there exists a singular solution given by

$$\vec{\Psi}_k^{(sing)}(\lambda):=\begin{cases}\vec{\Psi}_k(\lambda), & \lambda_k'\notin\mathbb{Z} \quad \text{i.e. (6)},\\ \vec{\Psi}_k(\lambda)\ln(\lambda-\lambda_k)+\mathrm{reg}(\lambda-\lambda_k), & \lambda_k'=-1 \quad \text{i.e. (8)},\\ \vec{\Psi}_k(\lambda)\ln(\lambda-\lambda_k)+\frac{P_{N_k}^{(k)}(\lambda)}{(\lambda-\lambda_k)^{N_k+1}}+\mathrm{reg}(\lambda-\lambda_k), & \lambda_k'\in\mathbb{N} \quad \text{i.e. (9)},\\ \begin{cases}\vec{\Psi}_k(\lambda)\ln(\lambda-\lambda_k)+\mathrm{reg}(\lambda-\lambda_k),\\ \vec{\Psi}_k^{(sing)}\equiv 0, \quad \text{if } \underline{r}^{(k)}=0,\end{cases} & \lambda_k'\in-\mathbb{N}-2 \quad \text{i.e. (11)}.\end{cases}\tag{13}$$

The singular part of $\vec{\Psi}_k^{(sing)}(\lambda)$ is uniquely determined. In logarithmic case of (8), (9) and (11), $\vec{\Psi}_k^{(sing)}(\lambda)$ is defined modulo the addition of a linear combination of regular solutions.

Definition 1 *The connection coefficients c_{jk}, $1\leq j,k\leq n$, are uniquely defined by*

$$\begin{cases}\vec{\Psi}_k(\lambda)=\vec{\Psi}_j^{(sing)}(\lambda)c_{jk}+\mathrm{reg}(\lambda-\lambda_j),\\ c_{jk}:=0,\ 1\leq k\leq n, \quad \textit{when}\ \ \vec{\Psi}_j^{(sing)}(\lambda)\equiv 0\ \textit{for}\ \lambda_j'\in-\mathbb{N}-2.\end{cases}$$

Observe that:

a) $c_{kk}=1$ for $\lambda_k'\notin\mathbb{Z}$, $c_{kk}=0$ for $\lambda_k'\in\mathbb{Z}$.

b) In case $\lambda_k'\in\mathbb{N}$, it may happen that $\vec{\Psi}_k\equiv 0$. This occurs when $\vec{r}^{\,(k)}=0$. In this case $c_{jk}=0$ for any $j=1,..,n$, namely the k-th column of the matrix $C=(c_{jk})$ is zero.

c) In case $\lambda_j'\in-\mathbb{N}-2$, it may happen that the there is no logarithmic singularity, namely $\vec{\Psi}_j^{(sing)}\equiv 0$. This occurs if $\underline{r}^{(j)}=0$. In such a case, we need to *define* $c_{jk}:=0$, for any k, so that the matrix $C=(c_{jk})$ has zero j-th row.

d) Letting $c_{jk}:=0$, for any k, when $\underline{r}^{(j)}=0$, a more explicit way to write the definition of connection coefficients is (4).

3 Matrix Solutions Ψ and Ψ^* of System (2)-(3), Monodromy and Invertibility

In the previous section, we have constructed a matrix solution

$$\Psi(\lambda):=[\vec{\Psi}_1(\lambda)\mid\cdots\mid\vec{\Psi}_n(\lambda)].\tag{14}$$

In Section 3.2 we will establish under which conditions it is fundamental.

Remark 1 System (2), (3) may have vector solutions that are analytic at all $\lambda_1, ..., \lambda_n$. Such solutions must be polynomials in λ, because ∞ is a Fuchsian singularity.

The following holds:

Lemma 2 *System (2), (3) has no polynomial vector solution if and only if A_1 has no negative integer eigenvalues. Equivalently (see Remark 1), System (2), (3) has a singular solution at any λ_k, $1 \leq k \leq n$, if and only if A_1 has no negative integer eigenvalues.*

Proof: This Lemma is proved in remark 1.1 of [3]. □

In [3] it is proved, under the *assumption (i)* of non integer λ_k''s, that (2) admits a matrix solution $\Psi^*(\lambda)$, whose k^{th} column, $k = 1, ..., n$, is analytic at all poles $\lambda_j \neq \lambda_k$. We prove existence of Ψ^* *without any assumption on* $\lambda_1', ..., \lambda_n'$.

Proposition 1 *Let the matrix A_1 be any (no assumptions). Then*
i) There exists a matrix solution $\Psi^* = [\vec{\Psi}_1^*(\lambda) \mid \cdots \mid \vec{\Psi}_n^*(\lambda)]$ such that

$$\vec{\Psi}_k^*(\lambda) = \mathrm{reg}(\lambda - \lambda_j) \quad \forall j \neq k. \tag{15}$$

ii) $\Psi^*(\lambda)$ is a fundamental matrix solution *if and only if none of the eigenvalues of A_1 is a negative integer. In this case, $\vec{\Psi}_k^{(sing)}(\lambda) \neq 0$ for any k, and $\vec{\Psi}_k^*(\lambda)$ has the following behaviour for λ close to λ_k*

$$\vec{\Psi}_k^*(\lambda) = \vec{\Psi}_k^{(sing)}(\lambda) + \mathrm{reg}(\lambda - \lambda_k)$$

$$= \begin{cases} \vec{\Psi}_k(\lambda) + \mathrm{reg}(\lambda - \lambda_k) & \text{if } \lambda_k' \notin \mathbb{Z}, \\ \vec{\Psi}_k(\lambda) \ln(\lambda - \lambda_k) + \mathrm{reg}(\lambda - \lambda_k) & \text{if } \lambda_k' \in \mathbb{Z}_-, \\ \vec{\Psi}_k(\lambda) \ln(\lambda - \lambda_k) + \frac{P_{N_k}^{(k)}(\lambda)}{(\lambda - \lambda_k)^{N_k+1}} + \mathrm{reg}(\lambda - \lambda_k) & \text{if } \lambda_k' \in \mathbb{N}. \end{cases} \tag{16}$$

$\Psi^*(\lambda)$ is uniquely defined by (15) and (16), and

$$\Psi(\lambda) = \Psi^*(\lambda) C, \qquad C := (c_{jk}). \tag{17}$$

Proof: See the Appendix. □

Remark 2 From the above proposition, we see that if none of the eigenvalues of A_1 is a negative integer and $\lambda_k' \in -\mathbb{N} - 2$, then $\underline{r}^{(k)} \neq 0$, namely $\vec{\Psi}_k^{(sing)} \neq 0$. For any k, the solution $\vec{\Psi}_k^*$ is always singular at λ_k. Indeed, if $\lambda_k' \in -\mathbb{N} - 2$, by statement above, $\underline{r}^{(k)} \neq 0$, so there is a log-singular solution; if $\lambda_k' = -1$ there always is a log-singular solution; if $\lambda_k' \in \mathbb{N}$, there always is a solution with at least the pole from $P^{(k)}(\lambda)/(\lambda - \lambda_k)^{N_k+1}$.

3.1 Monodromy of Ψ and Ψ^* associated to a loop around λ_k

Consider a small loop in $\mathcal{P}_\eta$ around a pole λ_k in counter-clockwise direction, not encircling the other poles; for example $\lambda - \lambda_k \mapsto (\lambda - \lambda_k)e^{2\pi i}$, $|\lambda - \lambda_k|$ small. Monodromy of $\Psi = [\vec{\Psi}_1|...|\vec{\Psi}_n]$ is easily computed from (12), which immediately implies

$$\vec{\Psi}_k(\lambda) \longmapsto \begin{cases} \vec{\Psi}_k(\lambda)\ e^{-2\pi i\lambda'_k}, & \lambda'_k \notin \mathbb{Z} \\ \\ \vec{\Psi}_k(\lambda), & \lambda'_k \in \mathbb{Z} \end{cases}$$

and from (4), which implies (note that j and k are exchanged here):

$$\vec{\Psi}_j(\lambda) \longmapsto \begin{cases} \vec{\Psi}_j(\lambda) + (e^{-2\pi i\lambda'_k} - 1)c_{kj}\ \vec{\Psi}_k(\lambda), & \lambda'_k \notin \mathbb{Z} \\ \\ \vec{\Psi}_j(\lambda) + 2\pi i c_{kj}\ \vec{\Psi}_k(\lambda), & \lambda'_k \in \mathbb{Z} \end{cases}$$

These formulae make sense also when $c_{kj} = 0$ for any k in the special case $\vec{\Psi}_j = 0$, possibly occurring when $\lambda'_k \in \mathbb{N}$, and when $c_{kj} = 0$ for any j in the special case $\vec{\Psi}_k^{(sing)} \equiv 0$, possibly occurring when $\lambda'_k \in -\mathbb{N} - 2$.

Proof: Indeed, we have:
a) in case $\lambda'_k \notin \mathbb{Z}$:

$$\vec{\Psi}_j = \vec{\Psi}_k c_{kj} + \mathrm{reg}(\lambda - \lambda_k) \longmapsto \vec{\Psi}_k e^{-2\pi i\lambda'_k} c_{kj} + \mathrm{reg}(\lambda - \lambda_k)$$
$$\equiv \vec{\Psi}_k e^{-2\pi i\lambda'_k} c_{kj} + \vec{\Psi}_j - \vec{\Psi}_k c_{kj}.$$

b) In case $\lambda'_k \in \mathbb{N}$ we have

$$\vec{\Psi}_j = \left(\vec{\Psi}_k \ln(\lambda - \lambda_k) + \frac{P^{(k)}}{(\lambda - \lambda_k)^{N_k+1}}\right) c_{kj} + \mathrm{reg}(\lambda - \lambda_k) \longmapsto$$

$$\longmapsto \left(2\pi i\vec{\Psi}_k + \vec{\Psi}_k \ln(\lambda - \lambda_k) + \frac{P^{(k)}}{(\lambda - \lambda_k)^{N_k+1}}\right) c_{kj} + \mathrm{reg}(\lambda - \lambda_k) = 2\pi i c_{kj}\vec{\Psi}_k + \vec{\Psi}_j$$

c) In case $\lambda'_k \in \mathbb{Z}_-$, we have

$$\vec{\Psi}_j = \vec{\Psi}_k \ln(\lambda - \lambda_k)c_{kj} + \mathrm{reg}(\lambda - \lambda_k) \longmapsto$$

$$\longmapsto \left(2\pi i\vec{\Psi}_k + \vec{\Psi}_k \ln(\lambda - \lambda_k)\right) c_{kj} + \mathrm{reg}(\lambda - \lambda_k) = 2\pi i c_{kj}\vec{\Psi}_k + \vec{\Psi}_j$$

In c) with $\lambda'_k \leq -2$, in case it happens that $\vec{\Psi}_k^{(sing)} \equiv 0$, we have

$$\vec{\Psi}_j = 0 + \mathrm{reg}(\lambda - \lambda_k) \longmapsto \vec{\Psi}_j$$

This last fits into the general formula $\vec{\Psi}_j \mapsto \vec{\Psi}_j(\lambda) + 2\pi i c_{kj}\ \vec{\Psi}_k(\lambda)$, because by definition $c_{kj} := 0$ for any j in this case. □

Next, we compute the monodromy of $\Psi^* = [\vec{\Psi}_1^*|\cdots|\vec{\Psi}_n^*]$, which exists when A_1 has no negative integer eigenvalues. We consider again a small loop around λ_k as above. We have

$$\vec{\Psi}_j^*(\lambda) \longmapsto \vec{\Psi}_j^*(\lambda) \qquad \forall j = 1, ..., n, \quad j \neq k,$$

$$\vec{\Psi}^*_k(\lambda) \longmapsto \begin{cases} e^{-2\pi i\lambda'_k}\vec{\Psi}^*_k(\lambda) + (e^{-2\pi i\lambda'_k}-1)\sum_{j\neq k} c_{jk}\vec{\Psi}^*_j(\lambda), & \lambda'_k \notin \mathbb{Z} \\ \\ \vec{\Psi}^*_k(\lambda) + 2\pi i \sum_{j\neq k} c_{jk}\vec{\Psi}^*_j(\lambda), & \lambda'_k \in \mathbb{Z} \end{cases}$$

Proof: Invariance of $\vec{\Psi}^*_j$ follows from (15). The only singular at λ_k solution is $\vec{\Psi}^*_k$. We use (17) and invariance of $\vec{\Psi}^*_j$. For $\lambda'_k \notin \mathbb{Z}$:

$$\vec{\Psi}^*_k = \vec{\Psi}_k - \sum_{j\neq k}\vec{\Psi}^*_j c_{jk} \;\longmapsto\; e^{-2\pi i\lambda'_k}\vec{\Psi}_k - \sum_{j\neq k}\vec{\Psi}^*_j c_{jk}$$
$$\equiv e^{-2\pi i\lambda'_k}(\vec{\Psi}^*_k + \sum_{j\neq k}\vec{\Psi}^*_j c_{jk}) - \sum_{j\neq k}\vec{\Psi}^*_j c_{jk}.$$

For $\lambda'_k \in \mathbb{Z}$, we use the behaviour of $\vec{\Psi}^*_k$ at λ_k and (17) with $c_{kk}=0$ (in the formula below $P^{(k)}_{N_k} \equiv 0$ when $N_k \leq -1$):

$$\vec{\Psi}^*_k = \vec{\Psi}_k \ln(\lambda-\lambda_k) + \frac{P^{(k)}_{N_k}}{(\lambda-\lambda_k)^{N_k+1}} + \mathrm{reg}(\lambda-\lambda_k) \longmapsto$$
$$\longmapsto\; 2\pi i\vec{\Psi}_k + \left\{\vec{\Psi}_k \ln(\lambda-\lambda_k) + \frac{P^{(k)}}{(\lambda-\lambda_k)^{N_k+1}} + \mathrm{reg}(\lambda-\lambda_k)\right\}$$
$$\equiv 2\pi i\vec{\Psi}_k + \vec{\Psi}^*_k \;= 2\pi i\sum_{j\neq k}\vec{\Psi}^*_j c_{jk} + \vec{\Psi}^*_k.$$

□

We summarize in the following

Proposition 2 *The monodromy matrices representing the monodromy of Ψ and Ψ^* for a small counter-clockwise loop around λ_k in $\mathcal{P}_\eta$ are as follows.*

a) The matrix Ψ is always defined. The monodromy is

$$\Psi \mapsto \Psi M_k, \qquad M_k = I + \alpha_k \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots & & \vdots \\ c_{k1} & c_{k2} & \cdots & c_{kk} & \cdots & c_{kn} \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots & & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & \cdots & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \qquad 1 \leq k \leq n,$$

where I is the $n\times n$ identity matrix, only the k-th row in the second matrix is non zero, and

$$\begin{cases} \alpha_k := (e^{-2\pi i\lambda'_k}-1), & \text{if } \lambda'_k \notin \mathbb{Z} \\ \\ \alpha_k := 2\pi i, & \text{if } \lambda'_k \in \mathbb{Z} \end{cases}$$

b) If A_1 has no negative integer eigenvalues, then Ψ^* exists. The monodromy is

$$\Psi^* \mapsto \Psi^* M^*_k, \qquad M^*_k = I + \alpha_k \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & \cdots & c_{1k} & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & & c_{2k} & & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & c_{kk} & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & c_{nk} & \cdots & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

where only the k-th column in the second matrix is non zero.

Remark 3 The matrix M_k is the matrix $(m_{ij}^{(k)})$ in Proposition I of the Introduction. For a clockwise loop, we analogously find that

$$[M_k^{-1}]_{kj} = \beta_k \; c_{kj}, \quad j \neq k; \qquad [M_k^{-1}]_{kj} = 0 \quad \text{otherwise};$$

$$[M_k^{-1}]_{jj} = 1, \qquad j \neq k; \qquad [M_k^{-1}]_{kk} = e^{2\pi i \lambda'_k};$$

where

$$\begin{cases} \beta_k := (e^{2\pi i \lambda'_k} - 1), & \text{if } \lambda'_k \notin \mathbb{Z}, \\ \\ \beta_k := -2\pi i, & \text{if } \lambda'_k \in \mathbb{Z}, \end{cases} \qquad \Longrightarrow \quad \beta_k = -e^{2\pi i \lambda'_k} \alpha_k.$$

Moreover

$$[(M_k^*)^{-1}]_{jk} = \beta_k \; c_{jk}, \quad j \neq k; \qquad [(M_k^*)^{-1}]_{ji} = 0 \quad \text{otherwise};$$

$$[(M_k^*)^{-1}]_{jj} = 1, \qquad j \neq k; \qquad [(M_k^*)^{-1}]_{kk} = [M_k^{-1}]_{kk}.$$

Remark 4 One can define the coefficients c_{kj}, for $j \neq k$, starting from Ψ and its monodromy matrices, as $c_{kj} := m_{kj}/\alpha_k$.

Corollary 1 *The first invariants of the monodromy matrices in Proposition 2 are*

$$\mathrm{Tr}(M_k) = n - 1 + e^{-2\pi i \lambda'_k}$$

$$\mathrm{Tr}(M_j M_k) = n - 2 + e^{-2\pi i \lambda'_j} + e^{-2\pi i \lambda'_k} + \alpha_j \alpha_k \; c_{jk} c_{kj}$$

$$= n - 2 + e^{-2\pi i \lambda'_j} + e^{-2\pi i \lambda'_k} + e^{-2\pi i (\lambda'_j + \lambda'_k)} \beta_j \beta_k \; c_{jk} c_{kj}$$

If A_1 has no negative integer eigenvalues, then

$$\mathrm{Tr}(M_k^*) = \mathrm{Tr}(M_k), \qquad \mathrm{Tr}(M_j^* M_k^*) = \mathrm{Tr}(M_j M_k).$$

From Proposition 1 we know that Ψ^* is fundamental if and only if A_1 has no negative integer eigenvalues. Thus:

Corollary 2 *Suppose that A_1 has no negative integer eigenvalues; then $M_1^*, ..., M_n^*$ generate the monodromy group of equation (2–3).*

3.2 On the Invertibility of C and $\Psi(\lambda)$

We establish necessary and sufficient conditions for the matrices $\Psi(\lambda)$ and $C = (c_{jk})$ to be invertible. Let $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_\eta$.

Remark 5 If $\vec{r}^{\,(k)} = 0$ (case $\lambda'_k \in \mathbb{N}$) then C has zero k-th column and also $\Psi(\lambda)$ has zero k-th column, so it is not a fundamental matrix. If $\underline{r}^{(k)} = 0$ (case $\lambda'_k \in -\mathbb{N} - 2$), then C has zero k-th row. In both cases, C is not invertible.

Lemma 3 i) *If A_1 has no negative integer eigenvalues and $\Psi(\lambda)$ is fundamental, then C is invertible.* **ii)** *Conversely, if C is invertible, then:*

– A_1 has no negative integer eigenvalues,

– $\Psi(\lambda)$ is fundamental,

– the matrix defined by $\Psi^*(\lambda) := \Psi(\lambda)C^{-1}$, is the unique fundamental solution Ψ^* of Proposition 1,

– in case $\lambda'_k \in \mathbb{N}$ then $\vec{r}^{\,(k)} \neq 0$, in case $\lambda'_k \in -\mathbb{N}-2$, then $\underline{r}^{(k)} \neq 0$.

Proof: **i)** If A_1 has no negative integer eigenvalues, then the fundamental matrix $\Psi^*(\lambda)$ exists form Proposition 1. If $\Psi(\lambda)$ is invertible, then $C = \Psi^*(\lambda)^{-1} \cdot \Psi(\lambda)$ is invertible.

ii) From Remark 5, we see that C invertible implies that $\vec{r}^{\,(k)} \neq 0$ and $\underline{r}^{(k)} \neq 0$, when defined. In particular, in any row and any column of C there is a $c_{ij} \neq 0$ for some $i \neq j$. Write $\Psi(\lambda)$ at λ_k:

$$\Psi = \left[\begin{array}{c|c|c} \vec{\Psi}_1 & \cdots & \vec{\Psi}_n \end{array} \right] = \left[\begin{array}{c|c|c} \vec{\Psi}_k^{(sing)} c_{k1} & \cdots & \vec{\Psi}_k^{(sing)} c_{kn} \end{array} \right] + \mathrm{reg}(\lambda - \lambda_k)$$

$$= \left\{ \left[\begin{array}{c|c|c|c|c|c|c} 0 & ... & 0 & \vec{\Psi}_k^{(sing)} & 0 & ... & 0 \end{array} \right] + \mathrm{reg}(\lambda - \lambda_k) \right\} C.$$

The last step is possible because existence of C^{-1} allows to write

$$\mathrm{reg}(\lambda - \lambda_k) = \mathrm{reg}(\lambda - \lambda_k)C^{-1}C \equiv \mathrm{reg}(\lambda - \lambda_k)C.$$

Thus

$$\Psi C^{-1} = \left[\begin{array}{c|c|c|c|c|c|c} 0 & ... & 0 & \vec{\Psi}_k^{(sing)} & 0 & ... & 0 \end{array} \right] + \mathrm{reg}(\lambda - \lambda_k).$$

This is equivalent to (15) and (16), which implies that there exist the unique fundamental matrix $\Psi^* \equiv \Psi C^{-1}$. From Proposition 1 we conclude that A_1 has no negative integer eigenvalues. Obviously, it follows also that $\Psi = \Psi^* C$ is invertible. $\square$.

Proposition 3 *C is invertible $\Longleftrightarrow$ A_1 has no integer eigenvalues.*

Proof: The "$\Longrightarrow$" is proved in the previous lemma, point ii). The proof of "$\Longleftarrow$" is analogous to that of proposition 2 in [3], which we repeat here without assumptions on $\lambda'_1, ..., \lambda'_n$. Since A_1 has no negative integer eigenvalues, there exists the unique fundamental Ψ^*. Therefore, the monodromy group is generated by $M_1^*, ..., M_n^*$. We consider the monodromy M_∞^* at infinity, for a counterclockwise loop encircling all the poles. For purpose of this proof we can numerate the poles in such a way that the ray L_{k+1} is to the left of the ray L_k. Thus,

$$M_\infty^* = M_n^* \cdots M_1^*.$$

The behavior of system (3) at ∞ is

$$\frac{d\Psi}{d\lambda} = -\frac{A_1 + 1}{\lambda} \left[I + O\left(\frac{1}{\lambda}\right) \right] \Psi.$$

This implies that A_1 has no integer eigenvalues if and only if M_∞^* has no eigenvalue $= 1$. We show that this is equivalent to the fact that C is invertible, namely has no zero eigenvalue. Indeed, existence of an eigenvalue equal to 1 means that there exists a non zero row vector

$\hat{w} = [w_1, ..., w_n]$, such that $\hat{w} M_\infty^* = \hat{w}$. Using the explicit expression of the M_k^* in terms of the $\alpha_k c_{jk}$'s, we compute

$$\hat{w}\ M_n^* \cdots M_1^*\ = \hat{w}\ + \sum_{j=1}^{n} b_j \hat{e}_j,$$

where the $\hat{e}_j$'s are the basis rows

$$\hat{e}_1 = [1, 0, ..., 0], \quad \hat{e}_2 = [0, 1, ..., 0], \quad \hat{e}_n = [0, ..., 0, 1],$$

and

$$b_n = \alpha_n\ (\hat{w}C)_n,$$

$$b_{n-1} = \alpha_{n-1}\Big[(\hat{w}C)_{n-1} + c_{n,n-1} b_n\Big],$$

$$\vdots$$

$$b_i = \alpha_i \left[(\hat{w}C)_i + \sum_{j=i+1}^{n} c_{ji}\ b_j\right]$$

for $i = 1, 2, ..., n-1$. Since all the α_i, for $1 \le i \le n$, are not zero, we conclude that $\hat{w} M_\infty^* = \hat{w}$ if and only if $\hat{w} C = 0$. Thus, A_1 has integer eigenvalues if and only if C has zero eigenvalue, namely is not invertible. $\square$.

Proposition 4 i) *If A_1 has no integer eigenvalues, then $\Psi(\lambda)$ is a fundamental matrix solution.*

ii) *With the additional assumption that $\lambda_k' \notin \mathbb{Z}$, $\forall k = 1, ..., n$, also the converse holds: if $\Psi(\lambda)$ is a fundamental matrix solution, then A_1 has no integer eigenvalues.*

Proof: i) If A_1 has no integer eigenvalues, C is invertible (Proposition 3). Therefore, the statement follows from Lemma 3, point ii).

ii) Let $\Psi = [\vec{\Psi}_1 | \cdots | \vec{\Psi}_n]$ be fundamental. Observe that under the hypothesis that $\lambda_k' \notin \mathbb{Z}$ for any k, the columns are singular. Namely:

$$\vec{\Psi}_k(\lambda) \equiv \vec{\Psi}_k^{(sing)}(\lambda) = (\Gamma(\lambda_k' + 1)\vec{e}_k + O(\lambda - \lambda_k))(\lambda - \lambda_k)^{-\lambda_k' - 1}, \qquad 1 \le k \le n.$$

The monodromy of $\Psi(\lambda)$ at infinity is $M_\infty = M_n M_{n-1} \cdots M_1$. Suppose that there is an integer eigenvalues of A_1. It follows that there exists a non zero column vector $\vec{v} = (v_1, ..., v_n)^t$ (t means transpose) such that $M_\infty \vec{v} = \vec{v}$. As in the proof of Proposition 3, making use of the explicit form of the M_k's in terms of the c_{jk}'s, we see that $M_\infty \vec{v} = \vec{v}$ is equivalent to $C\vec{v} = \vec{0}$. Take the vector $\vec{\psi}(\lambda) = \sum_{l=1}^n v_l \vec{\Psi}_l(\lambda)$. At every λ_k it behaves like

$$\vec{\psi}(\lambda) = \sum_{l=1}^{n} v_l \vec{\Psi}_k c_{kl} + \mathrm{reg}(\lambda - \lambda_k) = \Big(\sum_{l=1}^{n} c_{kl} v_l\Big)\vec{\Psi}_k + \mathrm{reg}(\lambda - \lambda_k)$$

But $\sum_{l=1}^n c_{kl} v_l = 0$, thus

$$\vec{\psi}(\lambda) = \mathrm{reg}(\lambda - \lambda_k), \quad \text{close to any } \lambda_k, \quad k = 1, \cdots, n.$$

This implies that $\vec{\psi}(\lambda)$ is a polynomial solution. This contradicts the fact that $\vec{\Psi}_1(\lambda)$,..., $\vec{\Psi}_n(\lambda)$ is a basis, each $\vec{\Psi}_k(\lambda)$ being singular at λ_k, $1 \le k \le n$. $\square$

Corollary 3 *If A_1 has no integer eigenvalues, then $M_1, ..., M_n$ of Proposition 2 generate the monodromy group of system (2).*

Corollary 4 *Suppose A_1 has some integer eigenvalues and $\Psi(\lambda)$ is a fundamental matrix solution (consequently, M_1, ...,M_n generate the monodromy group). In such cases, at least some λ'_k is necessarily integer.*

4 Relation between Matrices $\Psi^*(\lambda;\eta)$ as η changes

Following [3], we call *critical values* the inadmissible values for η, namely

$$\arg(\lambda_j - \lambda_k) \mod 2\pi.$$

We numerate them as in [3], as follows. In the angular interval $\left(-\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{3\pi}{2}\right]$ there is an even number m of critical values, ordered as

$$\frac{3\pi}{2} \geq \eta_0 > \eta_1 < \cdots > \eta_{m-1} > -\frac{\pi}{2}.$$

All the possible critical values are then

$$\eta_{\nu+hm} := \eta_n - 2h\pi, \quad \nu = 0, ..., m-1; \quad h \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

In each interval $(\theta - 2\pi, \theta]$ there are m such values. In other words, $\{\eta_\nu \mid \nu \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ is the set of all critical values.

There is an ordering of the poles with respect to an admissible η, given by the *dominance relation* $\prec$ below:

Definition 2 [as in [3]]: *Let η be admissible. We say that $j \prec k$, whenever in the plane $\mathcal{P}_\eta$ the cut L_j lies to the right of the cut L_k. Equivalently, choose the determinations*

$$\eta_{jk} := \textit{ determination of } \arg(\lambda_j - \lambda_k) \textit{ s.t. } \eta - 2\pi < \eta_{jk} < \eta, \quad j \neq k, \quad 1 \leq j, k \leq n.$$

Then

$$j \prec k \qquad \Longleftrightarrow \qquad -\pi + \eta < \eta_{jk} < \eta. \tag{18}$$

The reason for the nomenclature "dominance" will be explained in section 5.1.

Remark: $\lambda_1, ..., \lambda_n$ are in *lexicographical order with respect to the admissible η* when the labelling order $j < k$ coincides with the dominance order $j \prec k$.

The matrices $\Psi^{(k)}(\lambda)$, $\Psi(\lambda)$ and $\Psi^*(\lambda)$ defined in the plane $\mathcal{P}_\eta$, with η admissible, and the connection matrix C, depend on η. Therefore we write

$$\Psi^{(k)}(\lambda) = \Psi^{(k)}(\lambda, \eta), \qquad \Psi(\lambda) = \Psi(\lambda, \eta),$$
$$\Psi^*(\lambda) = \Psi^*(\lambda, \eta), \qquad C = C(\eta).$$

For two values $\eta < \tilde{\eta}$, we consider the plane with both the cuts of $\mathcal{P}_\eta$ and $\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\eta}}$. We denote by $\mathcal{P}_\eta \cap \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\eta}}$ the simply connected set of *reference points w.r.t. $\mathcal{P}_\eta$ and $\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\eta}}$*, namely the points in the doubly cut plane such that $\arg(\lambda - \lambda_k) \notin [\eta, \tilde{\eta}]$, $\forall k = 1, ..., n$. A pole λ_j is called *accessible* if it is on the boundary of $\mathcal{P}_\eta \cap \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\eta}}$. See figure 2.

We generalize propositions 3 of [3] without any assumptions on the values of $\lambda'_1, ..., \lambda'_n$.



Figure 2: Picture of $\mathcal{P}_\eta \cap \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\eta}}$.

Proposition 5 *i) Let λ_k be accessible w.r.t. some admissible η and $\tilde{\eta}$. Then*

$$\vec{\Psi}_k^{(k)}(\lambda,\eta) = \vec{\Psi}_k^{(k)}(\lambda,\tilde{\eta}) \quad \textit{and} \quad \vec{\Psi}_k(\lambda,\eta) = \vec{\Psi}_k(\lambda,\tilde{\eta}), \quad \forall \lambda \in \mathcal{P}_\eta \cap \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\eta}}$$

ii) Let η and $\tilde{\eta}$ lie between two consecutive critical values: namely $\eta_{\nu+1} < \eta < \tilde{\eta} < \eta_\nu$. Then

$$C(\eta) = C(\tilde{\eta})$$

iii) Let again $\eta_{\nu+1} < \eta < \tilde{\eta} < \eta_\nu$. Then

$$\Psi^*(\lambda,\eta) = \Psi^*(\lambda,\tilde{\eta}), \quad \forall \lambda \in \mathcal{P}_\eta \cap \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\eta}}.$$

whenever Ψ^* is uniquely defined (namely, when A_1 has no negative integer eigenvalues).

Proof: See the Appendix. □

The above implies that the dependence on η is discrete, namely it changes when a critical value is crossed. Thus, if $\eta_{\nu+1} < \eta < \eta_\nu$, we follow [3] and write

$$\Psi_\nu(\lambda) := \Psi(\lambda,\eta), \quad \Psi_\nu^*(\lambda) := \Psi^*(\lambda,\eta), \quad C_\nu = (c_{jk}^{(\nu)}) := C(\eta).$$

We now compute how $\Psi^*(\lambda,\eta)$ changes when η changes, so generalizing proposition 4 of [3], without assumptions on $\lambda_1', .., \lambda_n'$.

Proposition 6 *Suppose that A_1 has no negative integer eigenvalues, so that the $\Psi_\nu^*(\lambda)$'s exist, for $\nu \in \mathbb{Z}$. Let $\eta_{\nu+1} < \eta < \eta_\nu < \tilde{\eta} < \eta_{\nu-1}$. Then*

$$\Psi_{\nu-1}^*(\lambda) = \Psi_\nu^*(\lambda)\ W_\nu, \qquad \forall \lambda \in \mathcal{P}_\eta \cap \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\eta}}, \tag{19}$$

where the invertible matrix $W_\nu = (W_{jk}^{(\nu)})$ is

$$W_{jk}^{(\nu)} = -\alpha_k c_{jk}^{(\nu)}, \quad \textit{for } j \succ k \quad \textit{such that} \quad \arg(\lambda_j - \lambda_k) = \eta_\nu \tag{20}$$

$$W_{jj}^{(\nu)} = 1, \quad j = 1, \cdots, n; \qquad W_{jk}^{(\nu)} = 0 \ \textit{otherwise.} \tag{21}$$

where $\prec$ is the dominance relation w.r.t. η. In the same way,

$$\Psi_\nu^*(\lambda) = \Psi_{\nu-1}^*(\lambda)\ W_\nu^{-1}, \qquad \forall \lambda \in \mathcal{P}_\eta \cap \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\eta}},$$

where W_ν^{-1} has zero entries except for

$$[W_\nu^{-1}]_{jj} = 1, \quad j = 1, \cdots, n,$$

$$[W_\nu^{-1}]_{jk} = -\beta_k c_{jk}^{(\nu-1)}, \quad \textit{for } j \succ k \quad \textit{s.t.} \quad \arg(\lambda_j - \lambda_k) = \eta_\nu.$$

Note that $W^{(\nu)}_{jk} = -\alpha_k c_{jk}(\eta)$ for $\arg(\lambda_j - \lambda_k) = \eta_\nu$ implies that $j \succ k$,

Proof: See the Appendix. □

In an angular interval $(\theta - 2\pi, \theta]$, there are m critical values, m even. Let $\mu = m/2$. Let $\eta_{\nu+1} < \eta < \eta_\nu$ and introduce, as in [3], the matrices C^+_ν and C^-_ν such that

$$\Psi^*_{\nu+\mu}(\lambda) = \Psi^*_\nu(\lambda) C^+_\nu, \qquad \lambda \in \mathcal{P}_\eta \cap \mathcal{P}_{\eta-\pi}. \tag{22}$$

$$\Psi^*_{\nu+\mu}(\lambda) = \Psi^*_{\nu+m}(\lambda) C^-_\nu, \qquad \lambda \in \mathcal{P}_{\eta-\pi} \cap \mathcal{P}_{\eta-2\pi} \tag{23}$$

Immediately it follows that

$$C^+_\nu = (W_{\nu+\mu} \cdots W_{\nu+1})^{-1}, \quad C^-_\nu = W_{\nu+m} \cdots W_{\nu+\mu+1}. \tag{24}$$

Note[4]

Remark 6 $\mathcal{P}_\eta \cap \mathcal{P}_{\eta-\pi}$ is the half plane to the left hand side of all lines whose positive parts are the cuts of direction η, while $\mathcal{P}_{\eta-\pi} \cap \mathcal{P}_{\eta-2\pi}$ is the half plane to the right hand side of all lines whose positive parts are the cuts of direction $\eta - 2\pi$.

We restate remark 3.3 of [3] with no assumptions on A_1:

Lemma 4 *Let $\Lambda' := diag(\lambda'_1, ..., \lambda'_n)$, $\lambda'_k \in \mathbb{C}$, $1 \le k \le n$. Then*

$$\Psi_{\nu+m}(\lambda) = \Psi_\nu(\lambda) e^{2\pi i \Lambda'},$$

for any λ in the universal covering of $\mathbb{C} \backslash \{\lambda_1, ..., \lambda_n\}$. Moreover

$$C_\nu = e^{2\pi i \Lambda'} \; C_{\nu+m} \; e^{-2\pi i \Lambda'}, \qquad (\textit{namely: } C(\eta) = e^{2\pi i \Lambda'} \; C(\eta - 2\pi) \; e^{-2\pi i \Lambda'}).$$

Proof: See the Appendix. □

We generalize proposition 5 of [3], with no assumptions on $\mathrm{diag}(A_1) = (\lambda'_1, ..., \lambda'_k)$.

Proposition 7 *Let $\eta_{\nu+1} < \eta < \eta_\nu$, and let $c^{(\nu)}_{jk} = c_{jk}(\eta)$. Consider the relation (22) and (23). The connection matrices C^+_ν, C^-_ν are*

$$[C^+_\nu]_{jk} = \begin{cases} -\beta_k \; c^{(\nu)}_{jk} \;\; = \;\; e^{2\pi i \lambda'_k} \alpha_k \; c^{(\nu)}_{jk} & \textit{for } j \prec k \\ 1 & \textit{for } j = k \\ 0 & \textit{for } j \succ k \end{cases} \tag{25}$$

[4] Equivalent way to write (22) and (23):

$$\Psi^*(\lambda, \eta - \pi) = \Psi^*(\lambda, \eta) C^+_\nu, \quad \lambda \in \mathcal{P}_\eta \cap \mathcal{P}_{\eta-\pi},$$

$$\Psi^*(\lambda, \eta - \pi) = \Psi^*(\lambda, \eta - 2\pi) C^-_\nu, \quad \lambda \in \mathcal{P}_{\eta-\pi} \cap \mathcal{P}_{\eta-2\pi}.$$

$$[C_\nu^-]_{jk} = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{for } j \prec k \\ 1 & \text{for } j = k \\ e^{-2\pi i\lambda'_j}\beta_k\ c_{jk}^{(\nu)} \quad = \quad -e^{2\pi i(\lambda'_k-\lambda'_j)}\alpha_k\ c_{jk}^{(\nu)} & \text{for } j \succ k \end{cases} \tag{26}$$

where $\alpha_k = e^{-2\pi i\lambda'_k} - 1$ *if* $\lambda'_k \notin \mathbb{Z}$, $\alpha_k = 2\pi i$ *if* $\lambda'_k \in \mathbb{Z}$, $\beta_k = e^{-2\pi i\lambda'_k}\alpha_k$.

Proof: See the Appendix. □

The matrices C_ν^+ and C_ν^- *can be defined* by formulae (25) and (26), independently of the fact that A_1 has no negative integer eigenvalues, namely independently of (22) and (23). The following corollary is a direct computation.

Corollary 5 *Let the matrices* C_ν^+ *and* C_ν^- be defined *by formulae (25) and (26). Then*

$$\mathrm{Tr}(M_k) = n - 1 + e^{-2\pi i\lambda'_k}$$

$$\mathrm{Tr}(M_jM_k) = \begin{cases} n - 2 + e^{-2\pi i\lambda'_j} + e^{-2\pi i\lambda'_k} - e^{-2\pi i\lambda'_j}\ [C_\nu^+]_{jk}[C_\nu^-]_{kj} & \text{if } j \prec k, \\ n - 2 + e^{-2\pi i\lambda'_j} + e^{-2\pi i\lambda'_k} - e^{-2\pi i\lambda'_k}\ [C_\nu^-]_{jk}[C_\nu^+]_{kj} & \text{if } j \succ k. \end{cases}$$

If moreover A_1 *has no integer eigenvalues, then*

$$\mathrm{Tr}(M_k^*) = \mathrm{Tr}(M_k), \qquad \mathrm{Tr}(M_j^*M_k^*) = \mathrm{Tr}(M_jM_k).$$

5 Fundamental Solutions of (1) as Laplace Integrals

5.1 Fundamental solutions of (1) and Stokes Matrices

Definition 3 *Stokes rays are the oriented rays from 0 to* ∞ *contained in the universal covering of* $\mathbb{C}\backslash\{0\}$*, defined by the condition*

$$\Re(z(\lambda_j - \lambda_k)) = 0, \quad i \neq j, \quad 1 \leq i, j \leq n, \qquad z \in \widetilde{\mathbb{C}\backslash\{0\}}.$$

Let $\eta \in \mathbb{R}$ be admissible, namely $\eta \neq \arg(\lambda_i - \lambda_j) \bmod 2\pi$, for any $i \neq j$. We choose the Stokes rays

$$r_{jk} := \left\{ z \in \mathbb{C} \mid z = \rho \exp\left\{ i\left(\frac{3\pi}{2} - \eta_{jk}\right)\right\},\ \rho > 0\right\}, \quad j \neq k, \quad 1 \leq j, k \leq n,$$

where

$$\eta_{jk} = \text{ determination of } \arg(\lambda_j - \lambda_k) \quad \text{s.t. } \eta_{jk} \in (\eta - 2\pi, \eta].$$

If follows that

$$\begin{cases} \Re(z(\lambda_j - \lambda_k)) = 0, & \text{for } z \text{ belonging to the ray,} \\ \Re(z(\lambda_j - \lambda_k)) < 0, & \text{for } z \text{ in the half plane to the right of } r_{jk}. \end{cases}$$



Figure 3: Stokes' ray r_{jk}, defined by $\arg z = \frac{3\pi}{2} - \eta_{jk} \bmod 2\pi$. To the right of r_{jk}, $z = \frac{3\pi}{2} - \eta$, with $\eta_{jk} < \eta < \eta_{jk} + \pi$, and $\Re(z(\lambda_j - \lambda_k)) < 0$.

According to the definition, all the Stokes rays are characterized by

$$\arg z = \frac{3\pi}{2} - \eta_{jk} \mod 2\pi.$$

Moreover, for any (j,k) such that $\eta_{jk} < \eta < \eta_{jk} + \pi$ we have

$$\Re(z(\lambda_j - \lambda_k)) < 0 \quad \text{if} \quad \arg z = \frac{3\pi}{2} - \eta \bmod 2\pi.$$

This means that when we fix an *admissible* η for system (2)-(3), we have

$$\Re(z(\lambda_j - \lambda_k)) < 0 \text{ for } \arg z = \frac{3\pi}{2} - \eta \bmod 2\pi \quad \Longleftrightarrow \quad j \prec k \tag{27}$$

Indeed, by (18), $j \prec k$ means that $-\pi + \eta < \eta_{jk} < \eta$. Relation (27) explains why we have called $\prec$ a *dominance relation*: in the half plane to the right of r_{jk} the eigenvalue λ_k is dominant w.r.t. λ_j, in the usual sense of asymptotic theory of ODE with singularities of the II kind. A Stokes ray is represented in figure 3.

In the same way as all the critical values η_ν, $\nu \in \mathbb{Z}$, are obtained from η_{jk} by adding multiples of 2π, so all the Stokes rays are given by $\arg z = \tau_\nu$, where

$$\tau_\nu := \frac{3\pi}{2} - \eta_\nu,$$

$$0 \le \tau_0 < \tau_1 < \cdots < \tau_n < 2\pi; \qquad \tau_{\nu+mh} = \tau_n + 2\pi h, \quad h \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

Let us denote a sector in the universal covering $\widetilde{\mathbb{C}\backslash\{0\}}$ of $\mathbb{C}\backslash\{0\}$ in the following way

$$S(\alpha,\beta) := \{z \in \widetilde{\mathbb{C}\backslash\{0\}} \mid \quad \alpha < \arg(z) < \beta\}.$$

The following result is known [13], [2]: in any sector

$$\mathcal{S}_\nu := S(\tau_\nu - \pi, \tau_{\nu+1}), \qquad \nu \in \mathbb{Z},$$

equation (1) has a fundamental matrix solution

$$Y_\nu(z) = \hat{Y}_\nu(z)\ e^{A_0 z + \Lambda' \ln z}, \qquad z \in \mathcal{S}_\nu \tag{28}$$

where $\Lambda' = \ \mathrm{diag}(A_1)$, and $\hat{Y}_\nu(z)$ is an invertible matrix, analytic in a neighbourhood of ∞, with *asymptotic* expansion

$$\hat{Y}_\nu(z) \ \sim \ I + \frac{F_1}{z} + \frac{F_2}{z^2} + \cdots \ = I + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{F_k}{z^k}, \qquad \text{for } z \to \infty \text{ in } \mathcal{S}_\nu. \tag{29}$$

The sector $\mathcal{S}_\nu$ is the maximal sector where the asymptotic behavior holds, and $Y_\nu(z)$ is unique, namely it is uniquely determined by its asymptotic behavior. The $n \times n$ matrices F_k are determined as rational functions of A_0 and A_1, by formal substitution into (1) (see [13], [2]).

Definition 4 (Stokes Matrices) *Given two fundamental matrices Y_ν and $Y_{\nu'}$ as above, whose maximal sectors $\mathcal{S}_\nu$ and $\mathcal{S}_{\nu'}$ intersect in such a way that no Stokes rays are contained in $\mathcal{S}_\nu \cap \mathcal{S}_{\nu'}$, then the connection matrix S such that $Y_{\nu'}(z) = Y_\nu(z)S$, $z \in \mathcal{S}_\nu \cap \mathcal{S}_{\nu'}$, is called a* Stokes matrix.

Recall that in a sector $(\theta - 2\pi, \theta]$ there are m (even) critical values η_ν, $\nu = \nu_0, \nu_0+1, \ \dots, \nu_0+m-1$, therefore in $[\frac{3\pi}{2} - \theta, \frac{3\pi}{2} - \theta + 2\pi)$ there are m Stokes rays with directions τ_ν, $\nu = \nu_0, \nu_0+1, \ \dots, \nu_0 + m - 1$. Again, let $\mu = \frac{m}{2}$. Observe that $\eta_{\nu+\mu} = \eta_\nu - \pi$, therefore $\tau_{\nu+\mu} = \tau_\nu + \pi$. It follows that two matrices Y_ν and $Y_{\nu'}$ satisfying the conditions above are precisely $Y_\nu(z)$ and $Y_{\nu+\mu}(z)$. Therefore (see figure 4):

Definition 4′ (Stokes Matrices) *For any $\nu \in \mathbb{Z}$ is defined the* Stokes matrix *S_ν, which is the connection matrix such that*

$$Y_{\nu+\mu}(z) = Y_\nu(z)S_\nu, \qquad z \in \mathcal{S}_\nu \cap \mathcal{S}_{\nu+\mu} = S(\tau_\nu, \tau_{\nu+1}).$$

Observe that $\Re(z(\lambda_j - \lambda_k)) < 0$ for $j \prec k$ when $z \in S(\tau_\nu, \tau_{\nu+1})$, where the dominance relation is referred to a any $\eta \in (\eta_{\nu+1}, \eta_\nu)$. From the asymptotic behaviours of $Y_{\nu+\mu}(z)$ and $Y_\nu(z)$, it follows that $\delta_{jk} \sim e^{(\lambda_j - \lambda_k)z}(S_\nu)_{jk}$ and thus

$$(S_\nu)_{jj} = 1, \qquad (S_\nu)_{jk} = 0 \ \text{ for } j \succ k.$$

Definition 5 (Stokes Factors) *The* Stokes factors *are the connection matrices V_ν such that*

$$Y_{\nu-1}(z) = Y_\nu(z)V_\nu, \qquad z \in \mathcal{S}_{\nu-1} \cap \mathcal{S}_\nu = S(\tau_\nu - \pi, \tau_\nu).$$

It follows that $Y_{\nu+1}(z) = Y_{\nu+\mu}(z)V_{\nu+\mu} \cdots V_{\nu+1}$, (the r.h.s. is seen as the analytic continuation of the l.h.s.), and thus

$$S_\nu = \Big(V_{\nu+\mu} \cdots V_{\nu+1}\Big)^{-1}. \tag{30}$$



Figure 4: $Y_{\nu+\mu}(z) = Y_\nu(z)S_\nu$, $z \in \mathcal{S}_\nu \cap \mathcal{S}_{\nu+\mu} = S(\tau_\nu, \tau_{\nu+1})$, $\nu \in \mathbb{Z}$.

Observe that τ_ν and $\tau_{\nu-\mu} = \tau_\nu - \pi = -\tau_\nu$ are not contained in $S(\tau_\nu - \pi, \tau_\nu)$, while $\tau_{\nu-1}, ..., \tau_{\nu-\mu+1}$ are. It follows that $\Re(z(\lambda_j - \lambda_k))$ change sign in $S(\tau_\nu - \pi, \tau_\nu)$ except for (j,k) such that $\arg(\lambda_j - \lambda_k) = \eta_\nu$, or $\eta_\nu - \pi$. Precisely, $\Re(z(\lambda_j - \lambda_k)) < 0$ if $\arg(\lambda_j - \lambda_k) = \eta_\nu$, and $j \succ k$ with respect to $\eta \in (\eta_{\nu+1}, \eta_\nu)$. As above, we conclude that

$$(V_\nu)_{jj} = 1,$$

$$(V_\nu)_{jk} = 0 \quad \forall\, j \neq k, \text{ except possibly for } (j,k) \text{ s.t. } \begin{cases} \arg(\lambda_j - \lambda_k) = \frac{3\pi}{2} - \tau_\nu. \\ j \succ k \text{ w.r.t. } \eta \in (\eta_{\nu+1}, \eta_\nu). \end{cases}$$

Remark 7 i) The monodromy of $Y_\nu(z)$ is completely described by the *monodromy data* S_ν, $S_{\nu+\mu}$ and Λ', because the following holds

$$Y_\nu(ze^{2\pi i}) = Y_\nu(z)e^{2\pi i\Lambda'}(S_\nu S_{\nu+\mu})^{-1}, \qquad z \in \mathcal{S}_\nu. \tag{31}$$

For the above reason, S_ν and $S_{\nu+\mu}$ are a *complete set of Stokes multiplies*. Any other Stokes matrix can be expressed in terms of entries of S_ν, $S_{\nu+\mu}$ and Λ'.
ii) S_ν and $S_{\nu+\mu}$ are completely determined by $Y_\nu(z)$, $Y_{\nu+\mu}(z)$ and Λ', because

$$Y_{\nu+\mu}(z) = Y_\nu(z)S_\nu, \qquad z \in \mathcal{S}_\nu \cap \mathcal{S}_{\nu+\mu}, \tag{32}$$

$$Y_\nu(ze^{-2\pi i}) = Y_{\nu+\mu}(z)S_{\nu+\mu}e^{-2\pi i\Lambda'}, \qquad z \in \mathcal{S}_{\nu+\mu} \cap \mathcal{S}_{\nu+m}. \tag{33}$$

iii) $Y_{\nu+m}(z)$ is determined by $Y_\nu(z)$ and Λ', because

$$Y_{\nu+m}(ze^{2\pi i}) = Y_\nu(z)e^{2\pi i\Lambda'}, \qquad z \in \mathcal{S}_\nu. \tag{34}$$

Remark 8 In [6], [7], [8], and oriented *admissible line* l, namely a line not containing Stokes rays, is introduced to define the analytic continuation of Y_ν and $Y_{\nu+\mu}$. The branch cut is taken to be the negative part of l. We can take $l = l(\eta)$ such that its positive part is the ray from 0 to ∞ with angle $\tau = \frac{3\pi}{2} - \eta$.

Remark 9 If A_1 has some symmetries, then there may be a relation between S_ν and $S_{\nu+\mu}$. For example, in [6], [7] the case $A_1^T = -A_1$ is considered (where T means transposition). This implies that

$$S_{\nu+\mu}^T = S_\nu^{-1}.$$



Figure 5: The path $\gamma_k(\eta)$

5.2 Solutions of (1) as Laplace Integrals

We consider a path $\gamma_k(\eta)$ which comes from infinity along the left side of the cut L_k of direction η, encircles λ_k with a small loop excluding all the other poles, and goes back to infinity along the right side of L_k (where L_k is oriented from λ_k to ∞). See figure 5.

1) Case of $\lambda'_k \notin \mathbb{Z}$. We define

$$\boxed{\vec{Y}_k(z,\eta) := \frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{\gamma_k(\eta)} e^{z\lambda}\ \vec{\Psi}_k(\lambda,\eta)\ d\lambda\ \equiv \frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{\gamma_k(\eta)} e^{z\lambda}\ \vec{\Psi}_k^{(k)}(\lambda,\eta)\ d\lambda} \tag{35}$$

Due to the fact that λ_k is a regular singularity, the exponential ensures that the integral converges in the sector

$$\mathcal{S}(\eta) := \left\{ z \in \widetilde{\mathbb{C}\backslash\{0\}} \mid \Re(ze^{i\eta}) < 0 \right\} \quad \Longrightarrow \quad \frac{\pi}{2} - \eta < \arg z < \frac{3\pi}{2} - \eta. \tag{36}$$

The asymptotic behaviour of (35) can be computed by expanding the integrand $\vec{\Psi}_k(\lambda)$ in series at λ_k and then formally exchanging integration and series (see [5]). Namely, for any $\mathcal{N} > 0$ integer,

$$\vec{Y}_k(z,\eta) = \frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{\gamma_k(\eta)} e^{z\lambda}\ \left[\Gamma(\lambda'_k+1)\vec{e}_k + \sum_{l\geq 1} \vec{b}_l^{\,(k)}(\lambda-\lambda_k)^l\right](\lambda-\lambda_k)^{-\lambda'_k-1}\ d\lambda = (*)$$

Now write $\sum_{l\geq 1} = \sum_{l=1}^{\mathcal{N}} + \sum_{l>\mathcal{N}}$, and use the formula (see [5]):

$$\int_{\gamma_k(\eta)} (\lambda-\lambda_k)^{-a} e^{z\lambda} d\lambda = \frac{z^{a-1}e^{\lambda_k z}}{\Gamma(a)}.$$

We obtain

$$(*) = \left(\vec{e}_k + \sum_{l=1}^{\mathcal{N}} \frac{\vec{b}_l^{\,(k)}}{\Gamma(\lambda'_k + 1 - l)} \, \frac{1}{z^l} + \mathcal{R}(z) \right) \, e^{\lambda_k z} z^{\lambda'_k}, \tag{37}$$

where $\mathcal{R}(z)$ is the integral of $\sum_{l>\mathcal{N}}$. It is standard computation to show that $\mathcal{R}(z) = O(z^{\mathcal{N}})$. Thus, formula (37) allows us to write the asymptotic expansion

$$\vec{Y}_k(z,\eta) \; e^{-\lambda_k z} z^{-\lambda'_k} \sim \vec{e}_k + \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \frac{\vec{b}_l^{\,(k)}}{\Gamma(\lambda'_k + 1 - l)} \, \frac{1}{z^l}, \qquad z \to \infty, \quad z \in \mathcal{S}(\eta).$$

Lemma 5 *Assume $\lambda'_k \notin \mathbb{Z}$. Let $\eta \in (\eta_{\nu+1}, \eta_\nu)$, and $\tau_\nu := 3\pi/2 - \eta_\nu$. Then, $\vec{Y}_k(z,\eta)$ defined by (35) is the k-th column of the unique fundamental solution of (1) identified by the asymptotic behavior (28), (29) in the sector*

$$\mathcal{S}_\nu = S(\tau_\nu - \pi, \tau_{\nu+1}).$$

Proof: If $\eta_{\nu+1} < \eta < \tilde{\eta} < \eta_\nu$, then $Y_k(z,\eta) = Y_k(z,\tilde{\eta})$. This defines the analytic continuation of (35) to

$$S(\tau_\nu - \pi, \tau_{\nu+1}) = \bigcup_{\eta_{\nu+1} < \eta < \eta_\nu} \mathcal{S}(\eta),$$

with the required asymptotic behaviour. It remains to prove that $Y_k(z,\eta)$ is a vector solution of (1). This follows from integration by parts, as shown in the Introduction, since $\gamma_k(\eta)$ is such that $e^{\lambda z}(\lambda - A_0)\vec{\Psi}_k(\lambda)\Big|_{\gamma_k} = 0$. $\square$

We write coefficients in (29) as

$$F_k = [\; \vec{f}_1^{\,(k)} \;|\; \cdots \;|\; \vec{f}_n^{\,(k)} \;]$$

Thus, we can write (6) for $\eta_{\nu+1} < \eta < \eta_\nu$ as

$$\boxed{\vec{\Psi}_k(\lambda,\eta) \equiv \vec{\Psi}_k^{(k)}(\lambda) = \textstyle\sum_{l\geq 0} \Gamma(\lambda'_k + 1 - l) \; \vec{f}_l^{\,(k)} \; (\lambda - \lambda_k)^{l - \lambda'_k - 1}, \qquad \vec{f}_0^{\,(k)} = \vec{e}_k}$$

2) Case of $\lambda'_k = -1$. We define

$$\vec{Y}_k(z,\eta) := \int_{L_k} e^{z\lambda} \; \vec{\Psi}_k(\lambda,\eta) \; d\lambda \; = - \int_{-L_k} e^{z\lambda} \; \vec{\Psi}_k(\lambda,\eta) \; d\lambda \tag{38}$$

along the cut L_k from λ_k to infinity. This is convergent in $\mathcal{S}(\eta)$ as before. Its asymptotic behaviour is obtained as before by expanding $\vec{\Psi}_k$ in the convergent series (7), and then exchanging integration and series, the result having meaning of asymptotic series. We obtain, by elementary integration:

$$Y_k(z,\eta) = \vec{e}_k \int_{-L_k} e^{z\lambda} d\lambda - \sum_{l\geq 1} \vec{b}_l^{\,(k)} \int_{-L_k} (\lambda - \lambda_k)^l e^{z\lambda} \; d\lambda =$$

$$= \frac{e^{\lambda_k z}}{z}\left[\vec{e}_k + \sum_{l=1}^{\infty}(-1)^{l+1}\ l!\ \ \vec{b}_l^{\,(k)}\frac{1}{z^l}\right].$$

where we have used the fact that

$$\int_{-L_k}(\lambda-\lambda_k)^l e^{\lambda z}d\lambda = \frac{e^{\lambda_k z}}{z^{l+1}}\int_{+\infty e^{i\phi}}^{0}\xi^l e^{\xi}d\xi = \frac{e^{\lambda_k z}}{z^{l+1}}\ l!\ (-1)^l, \qquad \frac{\pi}{2}<\phi<\frac{3\pi}{2}.$$

The same proof of Lemma 5 yields the following

Lemma 6 *Assume $\lambda_k' = -1$. Let $\eta \in (\eta_{\nu+1}, \eta_\nu)$, and $\tau_\nu := 3\pi/2 - \eta_\nu$. Then, $Y_k(z,\eta)$ defined by (38) is the k-th column of the unique fundamental solution of (1) identified by the asymptotic behavior (28), (29) in the sector*

$$\mathcal{S}_\nu = S(\tau_\nu - \pi, \tau_{\nu+1}).$$

By virtue of the lemma, we rewrite (7), for $\eta_{\nu+1} < \eta < \eta_\nu$, as follows

$$\boxed{\vec{\Psi}_k(\lambda,\eta) = -\vec{e}_k + \textstyle\sum_{l\geq 1}\frac{(-1)^{l+1}}{l!}\vec{f}_l^{\,(k)}(\lambda-\lambda_k)^l}$$

Lemma 7 *In case $\lambda_k' = -1$, the solution (38) has also the representation*

$$\boxed{\vec{Y}_k(z,\eta) = \textstyle\int_{L_k} e^{z\lambda}\ \vec{\Psi}_k(\lambda,\eta)\ d\lambda\ \equiv \frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{\gamma_k(\eta)}\vec{\Psi}_k^{(k)}(\lambda)e^{z\lambda}\ d\lambda} \tag{39}$$

where $\gamma_k(\eta)$ is the same of (35).

Proof: Recall that $\vec{\Psi}_k^{(k)} = \vec{\Psi}_k(\lambda)\ln(\lambda-\lambda_k) + \mathrm{reg}(\lambda-\lambda_k)$. Since

$$\int_{\gamma_k}\mathrm{reg}(\lambda-\lambda_k)\ e^{z\lambda}\ d\lambda = 0$$

we have

$$\int_{\gamma_k(\eta)}\vec{\Psi}_k^{(k)}(\lambda)\ e^{z\lambda}\ d\lambda = \int_{\gamma_k(\eta)}\vec{\Psi}_k(\lambda)\ln(\lambda-\lambda_k)\ e^{z\lambda}\ d\lambda$$

Indicate with L_k^L and L_k^R the left and right sides of L_k (oriented from λ_k to ∞), and with $(\lambda-\lambda_k)_{R/L}$ the branch of $(\lambda-\lambda_k)$ to the right/left of L_k. Then

$$\int_{\gamma_k(\eta)} = \int_{-L_k^L} + \int_{L_k^R} = \int_{L_k^R} - \int_{L_k^L} = (*)$$

Moreover

$$(\lambda-\lambda_k)_L = e^{-2\pi i}(\lambda-\lambda_k)_R, \quad \text{where } \arg((\lambda-\lambda_k)_R) = \eta.$$

Therefore

$$(*) = \int_{L_k^R} \vec{\Psi}_k(\lambda) \ln(\lambda - \lambda_k)_R \; e^{z\lambda} \; d\lambda + \left\{ 2\pi i \int_{L_k} \vec{\Psi}_k(\lambda) \; e^{z\lambda} \; d\lambda - \int_{L_k^R} \vec{\Psi}_k(\lambda) \ln(\lambda - \lambda_k)_R \; e^{z\lambda} \; d\lambda \right\}$$

$$\equiv 2\pi i \int_{L_k} \vec{\Psi}_k(\lambda) \; e^{z\lambda} \; d\lambda.$$

□

3) Case of $\lambda_k' \in \mathbb{N}$. Define the convergent in $\mathcal{S}(\eta)$ integral

$$\boxed{\vec{Y}_k(z,\eta) := \tfrac{1}{2\pi i} \textstyle\int_{\gamma_k(\eta)} e^{z\lambda} \; \vec{\Psi}_k^{(k)}(\lambda,\eta) \; d\lambda} \tag{40}$$

where

$$\vec{\Psi}_k^{(k)}(\lambda) = \vec{\Psi}_k(\lambda) \ln(\lambda - \lambda_k) + \frac{P_{N_k}^{(k)}(\lambda)}{(\lambda - \lambda_k)^{N_k+1}} + \mathrm{reg}(\lambda - \lambda_k),$$

$$\vec{\Psi}_k = \sum_{l \geq 0} \vec{d}_l^{\,(k)} (\lambda - \lambda_k)^l, \quad P_{N_k}^{(k)} = N_k! \; \vec{e}_k + \sum_{l=0}^{N_k} \vec{b}_l^{\,(k)} (\lambda - \lambda_k)^l,$$

As before, we prove that

$$\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma_k(\eta)} e^{z\lambda} \vec{\Psi}_k(\lambda) \ln(\lambda - \lambda_k) d\lambda = \int_{L_k} e^{z\lambda} \vec{\Psi}_k(\lambda) d\lambda$$

$$= \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} (-1)^{l+1} \; l! \; d_l^{\,(k)} \; \frac{1}{z^{l+1}} \; e^{z\lambda_k}.$$

where "=" means asymptotic for $z \to \infty$. On the other hand, by Cauchy theorem,

$$\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma_k(\eta)} e^{z\lambda} \frac{P^{(k)}(\lambda)}{(\lambda - \lambda_k)^{N_k+1}} = \frac{1}{N_k!} \frac{d^{N_k}}{d\lambda^{N_k}} \left(P^{(k)}(\lambda) e^{z\lambda} \right) \Big|_{\lambda = \lambda_k}$$

$$= e^{\lambda_k z} \sum_{q=0}^{N_k} \frac{\vec{b}_{N_k - q}^{\,(k)}}{q!} \; z^q = \left[\vec{e}_k + \cdots + \frac{\vec{b}_{N_k}^{(k)}}{z^{N_k}} \right] z^{N_k} e^{\lambda_k z}, \qquad \vec{b}_0^{\,(k)} = N_k! \; \vec{e}_k.$$

We conclude that $\vec{Y}_k(z,\eta)$ has the correct asymptotics. The same proof of Lemma 5 yields the following

Lemma 8 *Assume $\lambda_k' \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $\eta \in (\eta_{\nu+1}, \eta_\nu)$, and $\tau_\nu := 3\pi/2 - \eta_\nu$. Then, $\vec{Y}_k(z,\eta)$ defined by (40) is the k-th column of the unique fundamental solution of (1) identified by the asymptotic behavior (28), (29) in the sector*

$$\mathcal{S}_\nu = S(\tau_\nu - \pi, \tau_{\nu+1}).$$

Accordingly, we rewrite for $\eta_{\nu+1} < \eta < \eta_\nu$:

$$\boxed{\vec{\Psi}_k^{(k)}(\lambda,\eta) = \sum_{l=0}^{N_k}(N_k-l)!\ \vec{f}_l^{\,(k)}\ u^{l-N_k-1} + \left[\sum_{l=0}^{\infty}\frac{(-1)^{l+1}\ \vec{f}_{N_k+l+1}^{\,(k)}}{l!}\ u^l\right]\ln(u) + \mathrm{reg}(u)}$$

where $u := \lambda - \lambda_k$.

4) case of $\lambda_k' = N_k \in -\mathbb{N}-2$. We define

$$\boxed{\vec{Y}_k(z,\eta) := \int_{L_k} e^{z\lambda}\vec{\Psi}_k(\lambda)d\lambda} \tag{41}$$

The asymptotic behaviour of the above is readily computed:

$$\int_{L_k} e^{z\lambda}\vec{\Psi}_k(\lambda)d\lambda = \int_{L_k} e^{z\lambda}\sum_{l\geq 0}\vec{b}_l^{(k)}(\lambda-\lambda_k)^{l-N_k-1}d\lambda$$

$$= e^{\lambda_k z}(-1)^{N_k}\sum_{l\geq 0}\frac{(-1)^l(l-N_k-1)!\ \vec{b}_l^{(k)}}{z^{l-N_k}}$$

$$= \left[\vec{e}_k + (-1)^{N_k}\sum_{l\geq 1}(-1)^l(l-N_k-1)!\ \vec{b}_l^{(k)}\ \frac{1}{z^l}\right] z^{N_k}e^{\lambda_k z}.$$

where we have used the normalization $\vec{b}_0^{(k)} = (-1)^{N_k}\vec{e}_k/(-N_k-1)!$. We conclude that $\vec{Y}_k(z,\eta)$ has the correct asymptotics. The same proof of Lemma 5 yields the following

Lemma 9 *Assume $\lambda_k' = N_k \in -\mathbb{N}-2$. Let $\eta \in (\eta_{\nu+1},\eta_\nu)$, and $\tau_\nu := 3\pi/2 - \eta_\nu$. Then, $\vec{Y}_k(z,\eta)$ defined by (41) is the k-th column of the unique fundamental solution of (1) identified by the asymptotic behaviour (28), (29) in the sector*

$$\mathcal{S}_\nu = S(\tau_\nu - \pi, \tau_{\nu+1}).$$

Accordingly:

$$\boxed{\vec{\Psi}_k(\lambda) = \sum_{l\geq 0}\frac{(-1)^{l-N_k}}{(l-N_k-1)!}\ \vec{f}_l^{\,(k)}\ (\lambda-\lambda_k)^{l-N_k-1}}$$

Also in this case we have

$$\frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{\gamma_k(\eta)} e^{z\lambda}\vec{\Psi}_k(\lambda)\ln(\lambda-\lambda_k)d\lambda = \int_{L_k} e^{z\lambda}\vec{\Psi}_k(\lambda)d\lambda$$

Therefore, *when the singular solution $\vec{\Psi}_k(\lambda)\ln(\lambda-\lambda_k) + reg(\lambda-\lambda_k)$ exists*, we have

$$\boxed{\vec{Y}_k(z,\eta) = \int_{\gamma_k(\eta)} e^{z\lambda}\Big(\vec{\Psi}_k(\lambda)\ln(\lambda-\lambda_k) + \mathrm{reg}(\lambda-\lambda_k)\Big)d\lambda.}$$

Proposition 8 *The following are the fundamental matrix solutions of (1) uniquely identified by the asymptotic behaviour (28), (29) in $\mathcal{S}_\nu$, $\nu \in \mathbb{Z}$:*

$$Y_\nu(z) = \left[\vec{Y}_1(z,\eta) \mid \cdots \mid \vec{Y}_n(z,\eta) \right]$$

$$\vec{Y}_k(z,\eta) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma_k(\eta)} e^{z\lambda} \ \vec{\Psi}_k^{(sing)}(\lambda,\eta) \ d\lambda, \quad 1 \le k \le n, \quad \eta_\nu < \eta < \eta_{\nu+1}, \tag{42}$$

where $\vec{\Psi}_k^{(sing)}$ is defined in (13). In case it happens that $\vec{\Psi}^{(sing)} = 0$, $\lambda'_k \in -\mathbb{N} - 2$, then (42) is replaced by (41).

Proof: The above is a consequence of the preceding discussion. Linear independence of the columns of $Y_\nu(z)$ follows from the independence of the first term of the asymptotic behaviour of each column. Uniqueness follows from the maximality of the sector. □

Lemma 10 *If A_1 has no negative integer eigenvalues, then, $\vec{\Psi}_k^{(sing)}$ in the integral (42) can be replaced by $\vec{\Psi}_k^*$. Namely:*

$$\vec{Y}_k(z,\eta) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma_k(\eta)} e^{z\lambda} \ \vec{\Psi}_k^*(\lambda,\eta) \ d\lambda, \quad 1 \le k \le n, \quad \eta_\nu < \eta < \eta_{\nu+1}.$$

Proof: Recall that if A_1 has no negative integer eigenvalues, then $\vec{\Psi}^{(sing)} \neq 0$ also for $\lambda'_k \in -\mathbb{N} - 2$. Since $\vec{\Psi}_k^{(sing)} - \vec{\Psi}_k^* = \mathrm{reg}(\lambda - \lambda_k)$, we have

$$\int_{\gamma_k(\eta)} \left(\vec{\Psi}_k^{(sing)}(\lambda) - \vec{\Psi}_k^*(\lambda) \right) e^{z\lambda} d\lambda = 0.$$

□

6 Stokes Factors and Matrices in terms of C - Main Theorem (Th. 1)

In this section we state the main result of the paper, which is Theorem 1 and Corollary 6.

Consider as in [3] a new path of integration $\gamma(\eta)$ homotopic to the product $\gamma_{k_n}(\eta) \cdots \gamma_{k_1}(\eta)$, $k_1 \prec k_2 \prec ... \prec k_n$, namely a path coming from ∞ in direction η to the left of all the poles $\lambda_1, ..., \lambda_n$, encircling all the poles, and going back to ∞ in direction η to the right of all the poles. The following Proposition is the generalization of Theorem 2′ of [3] when no assumptions are made on $\mathrm{diag}(A_1)$.

Proposition 9 *If A_1 has no negative integer eigenvalues the fundamental matrix of Proposition 8 is*

$$Y_\nu(z) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma(\eta)} e^{z\lambda} \ \Psi^*(\lambda,\eta) \ d\lambda, \qquad \eta_{\nu+1} < \eta < \eta_\nu.$$

and

$$Y_{\nu-1}(z) = Y_\nu(z) W_\nu, \qquad z \in \mathcal{S}_{\nu-1} \cap \mathcal{S}_\nu = S(\tau_\nu - \pi, \tau_\nu).$$



Figure 6: The paths $\gamma(\eta)$ and $\gamma(\tilde{\eta})$.

where the W_ν's are given in Proposition 6. Therefore, the Stokes factors are

$$V_\nu = W_\nu$$

Moreover,

$$S_\nu = C_\nu^+, \qquad S_{\nu+m}^{-1} = C_\nu^-.$$

Proof: The first statement is easy. Indeed $\Psi_k^*(\lambda) = \mathrm{reg}(\lambda - \lambda_j)$ for any $j \neq k$ implies

$$\int_{\gamma_k(\eta)} e^{z\lambda}\ \vec{\Psi}_k^*(\lambda,\eta)\ d\lambda = \int_{\gamma(\eta)} e^{z\lambda}\ \vec{\Psi}_k^*(\lambda,\eta)\ d\lambda$$

Then,we consider $\eta_{\nu+1} < \eta < \eta_\nu < \tilde{\eta} < \eta_{\nu-1}$ and

$$2\pi i Y_{\nu-1}(z) = \int_{\gamma(\tilde{\eta})} e^{z\lambda}\ \Psi^*(\lambda,\tilde{\eta})\ d\lambda = (*)$$

We can define the analytic continuation of $\Psi^*(\lambda,\tilde{\eta})$ along $\gamma(\eta)$ as follows. We consider on $\gamma(\tilde{\eta})$ a reference point λ_0 w.r.t. both $\tilde{\eta}$ and η, and deform $\gamma(\tilde{\eta})$ by keeping λ_0 fixed, until we obtain $\gamma(\eta)$. See fifure 6. Since λ_0 is a reference point, $\Psi^*(\lambda_0,\tilde{\eta}) = \Psi^*(\lambda_0,\eta)$. Thus the analytic continuation of $\Psi^*(\lambda,\tilde{\eta})$ along $\gamma(\eta)$ is $\Psi^*(\lambda,\eta)W_\nu$. Consequently

$$(*) = \int_{\gamma(\eta)} e^{z\lambda}\ (\Psi^*(\lambda,\eta)W_\nu)\ d\lambda = \left(\int_{\gamma(\eta)} e^{z\lambda}\ \Psi^*(\lambda,\eta)\ d\lambda\right)\ W_\nu\ \equiv 2\pi i Y_\nu(z)W_\nu.$$

The last statement follows from (24) and (30). □

We are going to prove that the statement of the above Proposition holds also *for any A_1, without assumptions.* This result is the following

Theorem 1 *Let A_1 be any $n \times n$ matrix, with no assumptions. The Stokes multipliers and matrices of system (1) are given in terms of the connection coefficients $c_{jk}^{(\nu)}$ of system (2) according to the formulae*

$$\boxed{V_\nu = W_\nu, \qquad S_\nu = C_\nu^+, \qquad S_{\nu+m}^{-1} = C_\nu^-, \qquad \forall \nu \in \mathbb{Z}}$$

where W_ν is defined *by formulae (20), (21), and C_ν^+ and C_ν^-* are defined *by formulae (25) and (26).*

Remark: Here formulae (20), (21), (25) and (26) *are taken as the definitions* of W_ν, C_ν^+ and C_ν^-, independently of the existence of $\Psi^*(\lambda)$.

Corollary 6 *Let A_1 be any $n \times n$ matrix, with no assumptions. The following equalities hold for the monodromy matrices of $\Psi(\lambda)$ of system (2)-(3), defined in (14):*

$$\boxed{\mathrm{Tr}(M_k) = n - 1 + e^{-2\pi i \lambda'_k}}$$

$$\boxed{\mathrm{Tr}(M_j M_k) = \begin{cases} n - 2 + e^{-2\pi i \lambda'_j} + e^{-2\pi i \lambda'_k} - e^{-2\pi i \lambda'_j}\ [S_\nu]_{jk}[S_{\nu+m}^{-1}]_{kj} & \text{if } j \prec k, \\ n - 2 + e^{-2\pi i \lambda'_j} + e^{-2\pi i \lambda'_k} - e^{-2\pi i \lambda'_k}\ [S_{\nu+m}^{-1}]_{jk}[S_\nu]_{kj} & \text{if } j \succ k. \end{cases}}$$

The corollary above is a restatement of Corollary 5. We prove Theorem 1 in a few steps.

7 Proof of Theorem 1

We define

$$ {}_\gamma Y(z) := z^{-\gamma} Y(z),$$

which yields a gauge transformation of the linear systems (1):

$$\frac{d}{dz}\ ({}_\gamma Y) = \left(A_0 + \frac{A_1 - \gamma}{z} \right)\ {}_\gamma Y \tag{43}$$

The fundamental solutions ${}_\gamma Y_\nu(z) = z^{-\gamma} Y_\nu(z)$, have the same Stokes multiplier and Stokes matrices than $Y_\nu(z)$, and their columns are obtained as Laplace transforms of solutions of

$$(A_0 - \lambda)\frac{d}{d\lambda}(\ {}_\gamma \Psi) = (A_1 - \gamma + I)\ {}_\gamma \Psi. \tag{44}$$

If A_1 has diagonal entries $\lambda'_1, ..., \lambda'_n$, some of which may be integers, then we can always find a sufficiently small $\gamma_0 > 0$ such that, for any $0 < \gamma < \gamma_0$, $A_1 - \gamma$ has diagonal entries $\lambda'_1 - \gamma, ..., \lambda'_n - \gamma$ which are not integers, and moreover has no integer eigenvalues, so that Ψ^* exists. In the following, we assume that γ has this property.

For system (2), the matrix $C_\nu = (c_{jk}^{(\nu)})$ is defined by (4). Consequently, the matrices C_ν^+ and C_ν^- are *always defined* by the formulae of Proposition 7, independently of the existence of Ψ^* and formulae (22) and (23). On the other hand, for system (44) the matrices C_ν^+ and C_ν^- (which depend on γ, so we write $C_\nu^+[\gamma]$ and $C_\nu^-[\gamma]$), are well defined by formulae (22) and (23). According to Proposition 7, their entries are again given in terms of γ-dependent connection coefficients $c_{jk}^{(\nu)} = c_{jk}^{(\nu)}[\gamma]$'s. The latter are defined by the first equality of (4) applied to the solutions ${}_\gamma\vec{\Psi}_k$, namely:

$$ {}_\gamma\vec{\Psi}_k(\lambda) = {}_\gamma\vec{\Psi}_j(\lambda)\ c_{jk}^{(\nu)}[\gamma]\ + \mathrm{reg}(\lambda - \lambda_j) \tag{45}$$

The following Proposition is the key step to prove Theorem 1

Proposition 10 *Let $\gamma_0 > 0$ be small enough such that the diagonal part of $A_1 - \gamma I$ has no integer entries and A_1 has no integer eigenvalues for any $0 < \gamma < \gamma_0$. Let $\eta_{\nu+1} < \eta < \eta_\nu$ be fixed. Let $c_{jk}^{(\nu)}$ be the corresponding connection coefficients of system (2), defined by (4), and $c_{jk}^{(\nu)}[\gamma]$ be the connection coefficients of (44), defined by (45). Finally, let*

$$\alpha_k = \begin{cases} e^{-2\pi i\lambda_k'} - 1, & \lambda_k' \notin \mathbb{Z} \\ \\ 2\pi i, & \lambda_k' \in \mathbb{Z} \end{cases}; \qquad \alpha_k[\gamma] = e^{-2\pi i(\lambda_k' - \gamma)} - 1$$

Then, the following equalities hold

$$\alpha_k c_{jk}^{(\nu)} = e^{-2\pi i\gamma}\alpha_k[\gamma]\ c_{jk}^{(\nu)}[\gamma], \qquad \text{if } k \succ j$$

$$\alpha_k c_{jk}^{(\nu)} = \alpha_k[\gamma]\ c_{jk}^{(\nu)}[\gamma], \qquad \text{if } k \prec j$$

where the partial ordering $\prec$ refers to η.

Corollary 7 *Let γ be as in Proposition 10. Let $C_\nu^+[\gamma]$ and $C_\nu^-[\gamma]$ be the connection matrices defined in (22) and (23) for system (44). Let C_ν^+ and C_ν^- be the matrices for system (2) defined by (25) and (26), where the $c_{jk}^{(\nu)}$ are defined by (4). Then*

$$C_\nu^+ = C_\nu^+[\gamma], \qquad C_\nu^- = C_\nu^-[\gamma], \qquad \forall \nu \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

Also, let W_ν be defined by (20) and (21) for system (2), and $W_\nu[\gamma]$ be the matrix defined by (19) for system (44). Then

$$W_\nu = W_\nu[\gamma], \qquad \forall \nu \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

Proof of Corollary 7: It is enough to compare the formulae of Proposition 10 with those of Propositions 7 and 6. □

Before proving Proposition 10, we give the proof of Theorem 1.

Proof of Theorem 1: The S_ν's are unchanged by the gauge ${}_\gamma Y(z) = z^{-\gamma}Y(z)$. Moreover, Proposition 9 applies to the system (44), therefore

$$S_\nu = C_\nu^+[\gamma], \qquad S_{\nu+m}^{-1} = C_\nu^-[\gamma], \qquad V_\nu = W_\nu[\gamma].$$

Thus, Corollary 7 implies Theorem 1. □.

7.1 Proof of Proposition 10, by steps

The idea is the same of the proof of Lemma $2'$ in [3], but with considerably more technical efforts, do to the fact that, unlike [3], we do not make any assumption on the diagonal entries of A_1. We need a few steps, which are Propositions 11 and 12 , and Lemmas 11, 12 below. First, we introduce the q-primitives of vector solutions of system (3).

– For $\lambda_k' \in \mathbb{C}\backslash\mathbb{N}$ we have solutions

$$\vec{\Psi}_k(\lambda) = \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \Gamma(\lambda_k' + 1 - l)\vec{f_l}^{\,(k)}\ (\lambda - \lambda_k)^{l-\lambda_k'-1}, \qquad \lambda_k' \notin \mathbb{Z}$$

and

$$\vec{\Psi}_k(\lambda) = \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^{l-N_k}}{(l-N_k-1)!}\ \vec{f_l}^{\,(k)}\ (\lambda - \lambda_k)^{l-N_k-1}, \qquad \lambda_k' = N_k \in \mathbb{Z}_-.$$

We define the q *primitive of* $\vec{\Psi}_k$. This is the function $(\vec{\Psi}_k)^{[-q]}(\lambda)$, $q \in \mathbb{N}$, given by analytic continuation of the series obtained by q-fold term wise integration of the corresponding term in $\vec{\Psi}_k(\lambda)$. Namely:

$$(\vec{\Psi}_k)^{[-q]}(\lambda) := (-1)^q \sum_{l=q}^{\infty} \Gamma(\lambda_k' + 1 - l)\vec{f}_{l-q}^{\,(k)}\ (\lambda - \lambda_k)^{l-\lambda_k'-1}, \qquad \lambda_k' \notin \mathbb{Z} \tag{46}$$

$$(\vec{\Psi}_k)^{[-q]}(\lambda) := (-1)^q \sum_{l=q}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^{l-N_k}}{(l-N_k-1)!}\ \vec{f}_{l-q}^{\,(k)}\ (\lambda - \lambda_k)^{l-N_k-1}, \qquad \lambda_k' = N_k \le -1. \tag{47}$$

They above converge in a neighbourhood of λ_k, contained in $\mathcal{P}_\eta$, where $\vec{\Psi}_k$ has convergent series. Indeed, if $\lambda_0 \neq \lambda_k$ is in the neighbourhood, then

$$\int_{\lambda_0}^{\lambda} ds_1 \int_{\lambda_0}^{s_1} ds_2 \cdots \int_{\lambda_0}^{s_{q-1}} ds_q \vec{\Psi}_k(s_q) = (\vec{\Psi}_k)^{[-q]}(\lambda) - Q_{q-1}(\lambda - \lambda_0) \tag{48}$$

where

$$Q_{q-1}(\lambda - \lambda_0) = (\vec{\Psi}_k)^{[-q]}(\lambda_0) + (\vec{\Psi}_k)^{[1-q]}(\lambda_0)(\lambda - \lambda_0) + \\ + \frac{(\vec{\Psi}_k)^{[2-q]}(\lambda_0)}{2!}(\lambda - \lambda_0)^2 + \cdots + \frac{(\vec{\Psi}_k)^{[-1]}(\lambda_0)}{(q-1)!}(\lambda - \lambda_0)^{q-1}$$

is a polynomial in $(\lambda - \lambda_0)$ of degree $q-1$. The path of integration is any in $\mathcal{P}_\eta$, such that $|\lambda - \lambda_0|$ is small enough for the series of $\vec{\Psi}_k$ to converge. In particular, for $\Re\lambda_k' < 0$,

$$(\vec{\Psi}_k)^{[-q]}(\lambda) = \int_{\lambda_k}^{\lambda} ds_1 \int_{\lambda_k}^{s_1} ds_2 \cdots \int_{\lambda_k}^{s_{q-1}} ds_q \vec{\Psi}_k(s_q)$$

Once $(\vec{\Psi}_k)^{[-q]}(\lambda)$ is defined by the convergent series, then it is analytically continued to $\mathcal{P}_\eta$.

– For $\lambda'_k = N_k \in \mathbb{N}$ integer, consider the solution

$$\vec{\Psi}^{(k)}_k(\lambda) = \vec{\Psi}_k(\lambda)\ln(\lambda-\lambda_k) + \frac{P^{(k)}_{N_k}(\lambda)}{(\lambda-\lambda_k)^{N_k+1}} + \mathrm{reg}(\lambda-\lambda_k)$$

$$P^{(k)}_{N_k}(\lambda) = \sum_{l=0}^{N_k}(N_k-l)!\ \vec{f}^{\,(k)}_l\ (\lambda-\lambda_k)^l$$

$$\vec{\Psi}_k(\lambda) = \sum_{l=0}^{\infty}\frac{(-1)^{l+1}}{l!}\ \vec{f}^{\,(k)}_{N_k+l+1}\ (\lambda-\lambda_k)^l$$

The series is convergent in a neighbourhood of λ_k contained in $\mathcal{P}_\eta$. Let λ_0 belong to the neighbourhood. Let $q \geq 0$ integer, and compute q times the integral of $\vec{\Psi}^{(k)}_k(\lambda)$. Due to convergence of the series, we can take integration term by term. We obtain:

i) For $q \leq N_k$:

$$\int_{\lambda_0}^{\lambda} ds_1 \int_{\lambda_0}^{s_1} ds_2 \cdots \int_{\lambda_0}^{s_{q-1}} ds_q \vec{\Psi}^{(k)}_k(s_q) =$$

$$= \sum_{l=0}^{\infty}\frac{(-1)^{l+1-q}}{l!}\ \vec{f}^{\,(k)}_{N_k+1+l-q}\ (\lambda-\lambda_k)^l\ \ln(\lambda-\lambda_k) + \frac{P^{(k)}_{N_k-q}(\lambda)}{(\lambda-\lambda_k)^{N_k+1-q}} + \mathrm{reg}(\lambda-\lambda_k)$$

$$P^{(k)}_{N_k-q}(\lambda) = (-1)^q \sum_{l=0}^{N_k-q}(N_k-l-q)!\ \vec{f}^{\,(k)}_l\ (\lambda-\lambda_k)^l$$

ii) For $q = N_k + 1$:

$$\int_{\lambda_0}^{\lambda} ds_1 \int_{\lambda_0}^{s_1} ds_2 \cdots \int_{\lambda_0}^{s_{N_k}} ds_{N_k+1} \vec{\Psi}^{(k)}_k(s_{N_k+1}) = \hat{\Psi}_k(\lambda)\ln(\lambda-\lambda_k) + \mathrm{reg}(\lambda-\lambda_k)$$

where we defined

$$\boxed{\hat{\Psi}_k(\lambda) := \textstyle\sum_{l=0}^{\infty}\frac{(-1)^{l+N_k}}{l!}\ \vec{f}^{\,(k)}_l\ (\lambda-\lambda_k)^l} \tag{49}$$

The function $\hat{\Psi}_k(\lambda)$ is defined by the series, that converges in the neighbourhood of λ_k in $\mathcal{P}_\eta$, where the series of $\vec{\Psi}^{(k)}_k$ converges. Then it is analytically continued in $\mathcal{P}_\eta$. Note that if all $r^{(k)}_j = 0$, $\forall j$, namely when there is no logarithmic term in $\vec{\Psi}^{(k)}_k$, then the sum in $\hat{\Psi}_k(\lambda)$ is truncated to $\sum_{l=0}^{N_k}$, giving a polynomial of degree N_k.

iii) For $q = N_k + 1 + \tilde{q}$, with $\tilde{q} \geq 0$:

$$\int_{\lambda_0}^{\lambda} ds_1 \int_{\lambda_0}^{s_1} ds_2 \cdots \int_{\lambda_0}^{s_{q-1}} ds_q \vec{\Psi}^{(k)}_k(s_q) = (\hat{\Psi}_k)^{[-\tilde{q}]}(\lambda)\ln(\lambda-\lambda_k) + \mathrm{reg}(\lambda-\lambda_k)$$

$$\boxed{(\hat{\Psi}_k)^{[-\tilde{q}]}(\lambda) = (-1)^{\tilde{q}}\textstyle\sum_{l=\tilde{q}}^{\infty}\frac{(-1)^{l+N_k}}{l!}\ \vec{f}^{\,(k)}_{l-\tilde{q}}\ (\lambda-\lambda_k)^l}$$

The function $(\hat{\Psi}_k)^{[-q]}(\lambda)$ is the q *primitive* of $\hat{\Psi}_k(\lambda)$, and the same computation of (48) yields

$$\int_{\lambda_0}^{\lambda} ds_1 \int_{\lambda_0}^{s_1} ds_2 \cdots \int_{\lambda_0}^{s_{q-1}} ds_q \hat{\Psi}_k(s_q) = (\hat{\Psi}_k)^{[-q]}(\lambda) - Q_{q-1}(\lambda - \lambda_0) \tag{50}$$

where Q_{q-1} is as in (48) with substitution $\vec{\Psi}_k \mapsto \hat{\Psi}_k$.

Remark 10 The computation at point i) above can be also read as follows. Let

$$(\hat{\Psi}_k)^{[r]}(\lambda) := \frac{d^r}{d\lambda^r}\Big(\hat{\Psi}(\lambda)\Big)$$

$$= \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^{l+N_k-r}}{l!}\ \vec{f}^{\,(k)}_{l+r}\ (\lambda - \lambda_k)^l, \qquad 0 \le r \le N_k + 1$$

In particular

$$(\hat{\Psi}_k)^{[N_k+1]}(\lambda) = \vec{\Psi}_k(\lambda).$$

Then

$$\frac{d^r}{d\lambda^r}\Big(\hat{\Psi}_k(\lambda)\ln(\lambda - \lambda_k) + \mathrm{reg}(\lambda - \lambda_k)\Big) = (\hat{\Psi}_k)^{[r]}(\lambda)\ln(\lambda - \lambda_k) + \frac{P^{(k)}_{r-1}(\lambda)}{(\lambda - \lambda_k)^r} + \mathrm{reg}(\lambda - \lambda_k)$$

with

$$P^{(k)}_{r-1}(\lambda) = (-1)^{N_k+1-r} \sum_{l=0}^{r-1} (r-1-l)!\ \vec{f}^{\,(k)}_l\ (\lambda - \lambda_k)^l.$$

We summarize (48) and (50) and the computations involving logarithmic solutions in the following

Proposition 11 *Let $\lambda_0 \neq \lambda_j$ for any $j = 1, 2, ..., n$.*

$\diamond$ For a given $k \in \{1, ..., n\}$ define

$$\phi_k(\lambda) := \begin{cases} \vec{\Psi}_k(\lambda), & \text{if } \lambda'_k \in \mathbb{C}\backslash\mathbb{N}, \\ \\ \hat{\Psi}_k(\lambda), & \text{if } \lambda'_k \in \mathbb{N}, \end{cases}$$

$$\Phi^{[-q]}_k(\lambda, \lambda_0) := \int_{\lambda_0}^{\lambda} ds_1 \int_{\lambda_0}^{s_1} ds_2 \cdots \int_{\lambda_0}^{s_{q-1}} ds_q \phi_k(s_q), \tag{51}$$

where $\vec{\Psi}_k$ are defined in (12) , and $\hat{\Psi}$ is defined in (49). Then

$$\Phi^{[-q]}_k(\lambda, \lambda_0) = (\phi_k)^{[-q]}(\lambda) - Q^{(k)}_{q-1}(\lambda - \lambda_0) \tag{52}$$

where $Q^{(k)}_{q-1}$ is a polynomial of degree $q-1$ in $(\lambda - \lambda_0)$. It follows from the definition that

$$\int_{\lambda_0}^{\lambda} ds\ \Phi^{[-q]}_k(s, \lambda_0)\ =\ \Phi^{[-q-1]}_k(\lambda, \lambda_0) \tag{53}$$

$\diamond$ *For $\lambda'_k \in \mathbb{Z}$, consider the singular solutions $\vec{\Psi}_k^{(sing)}$ of system (2):*

$$\varepsilon_k \vec{\Psi}_k(\lambda)\ln(\lambda-\lambda_k) + \mathrm{reg}(\lambda-\lambda_k), \qquad \lambda'_k \in \mathbb{Z}_-,$$

$$\vec{\Psi}_k(\lambda)\ln(\lambda-\lambda_k) + \frac{P^{(k)}(\lambda)}{(\lambda-\lambda_k)^{N_k+1}} + \mathrm{reg}(\lambda-\lambda_k), \qquad \lambda'_k = N_k \in \mathbb{N}.$$

In the above, $\varepsilon_k = 0$ if $\vec{\Psi}_k^{(sing)} \equiv 0$, otherwise $\varepsilon_k = 1$. Then, for $\lambda'_k \in \mathbb{Z}_-$:

$$\int_{\lambda_0}^{\lambda} ds_1 \int_{\lambda_0}^{s_1} ds_2 \cdots \int_{\lambda_0}^{s_{q-1}} ds_q \Big(\varepsilon_k \vec{\Psi}_k(s_q)\ln(s_q-\lambda_k) + \mathrm{reg}(s_q-\lambda_k)\Big) =$$

$$= \varepsilon_k (\vec{\Psi}_k)^{[-q]}(\lambda)\ln(\lambda-\lambda_k) + \mathrm{reg}(\lambda-\lambda_k), \qquad q \geq 0, \tag{54}$$

and for $\lambda'_k \in \mathbb{N}$:

$$\int_{\lambda_0}^{\lambda} ds_1 \int_{\lambda_0}^{s_1} ds_2 \cdots \int_{\lambda_0}^{s_{q-1}} ds_q \left(\vec{\Psi}_k(s_q)\ln(s_q-\lambda_k) + \frac{P_{N_k}^{(k)}(s_q)}{(s_q-\lambda_k)^{N_k+1}} + reg(s_q-\lambda_k)\right) =$$

$$= \begin{cases} (\hat{\Psi}_k)^{[N_k+1-q]}(\lambda)\ln(\lambda-\lambda_k) + \frac{P_{N_k-q}^{(k)}(\lambda)}{(\lambda-\lambda_k)^{N_k+1-q}} + \mathrm{reg}(\lambda-\lambda_k)\ , & 0 \leq q \leq N_k \\ \\ (\hat{\Psi}_k)^{[-q+N_k+1]}(\lambda)\ln(\lambda-\lambda_k) + \mathrm{reg}(\lambda-\lambda_k)\ , & q \geq N_k+1 \end{cases} \tag{55}$$

The above expressions hold by analytic continuation for $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_\eta$.

Corollary 8 *Let $\lambda'_k = N_k \in \mathbb{N}$. Let c_{jk} denote $c_{jk}(\eta) = c_{jk}^{(\nu)}$. The vector function $\hat{\Psi}_k(\lambda)$ in (49), $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_\eta$, has the following behaviours at $\lambda_j \neq \lambda_k$.*

For $\lambda'_j \notin \mathbb{Z}$:

$$\hat{\Psi}_k(\lambda) = \vec{\Psi}_j^{[-N_k-1]}(\lambda)c_{jk} + \mathrm{reg}(\lambda-\lambda_j) \tag{56}$$

For $\lambda'_j = N_j \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\hat{\Psi}_k(\lambda) = \begin{cases} \left(\hat{\Psi}_j^{[N_j-N_k]}(\lambda)\log(\lambda-\lambda_j) + \frac{P_{N_j-N_k-1}(\lambda)}{(\lambda-\lambda_j)^{N_j-N_k}}\right)c_{jk} + \mathrm{reg}(\lambda-\lambda_j) & N_j \geq N_k+1 \\ \hat{\Psi}_j^{[-N_k+N_j]}(\lambda)\log(\lambda-\lambda_j)\ c_{jk}\ + \mathrm{reg}(\lambda-\lambda_j) & N_k \geq N_j \end{cases} \tag{57}$$

For $\lambda'_j = N_j \in \mathbb{Z}_-$:

$$\hat{\Psi}_k(\lambda) = \vec{\Psi}_j^{[-N_k-1]}\ln(\lambda-\lambda_j)\ c_{jk} + \mathrm{reg}(\lambda-\lambda_j), \tag{58}$$

Note that (58) always makes sense, because $c_{jk} = 0$ for any $k = 1, .., n$ when $\vec{\Psi}_j^{(sing)} \equiv 0$.

Proof of Corollary 8: We use the formulae of Proposition 11. We observe that

$$\int_{\lambda_0}^{\lambda} d\xi_{N_k+1} \int_{\lambda_0}^{\xi_{N_k}} \cdots \int d\xi_1 \hat{\Psi}_k^{[N_k+1]}(\xi_1) =$$

$$= \hat{\Psi}_k(\lambda) - \sum_{l=0}^{N_k} \frac{(-1)^{l+N_k}}{l!} \ \vec{f}_l^{\,(k)} \ (\lambda - \lambda_k)^l - Q_{N_k}(\lambda - \lambda_0)$$

$$= \hat{\Psi}_k(\lambda) + \mathrm{reg}(\lambda) \tag{59}$$

where Q_{N_k} is a polynomial in $(\lambda - \lambda_0)$ of degree N_k and $\mathrm{reg}(\lambda)$ is analytic of $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$. Now recall that $\hat{\Psi}_k^{[N_k+1]} = \vec{\Psi}_k$. Using (4), we have

$$\hat{\Psi}_k^{[N_k+1]}(\xi_1) = \begin{cases} \vec{\Psi}_j(\xi_1)c_{jk} + \mathrm{reg}(\xi_1 - \lambda_j), & \lambda_j' \notin \mathbb{Z} \\ \left(\vec{\Psi}_j(\xi_1)\log(\xi_1 - \lambda_j) + \frac{P^{(j)}(\xi_1)}{(\xi_1 - \lambda_j)^{N_j+1}}\right) c_{jk} + \mathrm{reg}(\xi_1 - \lambda_j), & \lambda_j' = N_j \in \mathbb{N} \\ \vec{\Psi}_j(\xi_1)\log(\xi_1 - \lambda_j)c_{jk} + \mathrm{reg}(\xi_1 - \lambda_j), & \lambda_j' \in \mathbb{Z}_- \end{cases}$$

When $\lambda_j' \notin \mathbb{Z}$, from (4) and (59), we have

$$\hat{\Psi}_k(\lambda) = \mathrm{reg}(\lambda) + \int_{\lambda_0}^{\lambda} d\xi_{N_k+1} \int_{\lambda_0}^{\xi_{N_k}} \cdots \int d\xi_1 \left[\vec{\Psi}_j(\xi_1)c_{jk} + \mathrm{reg}(\xi_1 - \lambda_j)\right] =$$

$$= \mathrm{reg}(\lambda) + \Phi_j^{[-N_k-1]}(\lambda)c_{jk} + \mathrm{reg}(\lambda - \lambda_j)$$

$$= \mathrm{reg}(\lambda) + \left(\vec{\Psi}_j^{[-N_k-1]}(\lambda) - Q_{N_k}(\lambda - \lambda_0)\right)c_{jk} + \mathrm{reg}(\lambda - \lambda_j)$$

$$= \vec{\Psi}_j^{[-N_k-1]}(\lambda)c_{jk} + \mathrm{reg}(\lambda - \lambda_j).$$

When $\lambda_j' = N_j \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\hat{\Psi}_k(\lambda) = \mathrm{reg}(\lambda) +$$

$$+ \int_{\lambda_0}^{\lambda} d\xi_{N_k+1} \int_{\lambda_0}^{\xi_{N_k}} \cdots \int d\xi_1 \left[\left(\vec{\Psi}_j(\xi_1)\ln(\xi_1 - \lambda_j) + \frac{P_{N_j}^{(j)}(\xi_1)}{(\xi_1 - \lambda_j)^{N_j+1}}\right) c_{jk} + \mathrm{reg}(\xi_1 - \lambda_j)\right]$$

$$= \begin{cases} \left(\hat{\Psi}_j^{[N_j-N_k]}(\lambda)\log(\lambda - \lambda_j) + \frac{P_{N_j-N_k-1}(\lambda)}{(\lambda-\lambda_j)^{N_j-N_k}}\right) c_{jk} + \mathrm{reg}(\lambda - \lambda_j) & N_j \geq N_k + 1 \\ \hat{\Psi}_j^{[-N_k+N_j]}(\lambda)\log(\lambda - \lambda_j)\ c_{jk} \ + \mathrm{reg}(\lambda - \lambda_j) & N_k \geq N_j \end{cases}$$

where the last step follows form Proposition 11.
When $\lambda_j' = N_j \in \mathbb{Z}_-$, again from Proposition 11 we have:

$$\hat{\Psi}_k(\lambda) = \mathrm{reg}(\lambda) +$$

$$+ \int_{\lambda_0}^{\lambda} d\xi_{N_k+1} \int_{\lambda_0}^{\xi_{N_k}} \cdots \int d\xi_1 \left(\vec{\Psi}_j(\xi_1)\ln(\xi_1 - \lambda_j)c_{jk} + \mathrm{reg}(\xi_1 - \lambda_j)\right)$$

$$= \vec{\Psi}_j^{[-N_k-1]}\ln(\lambda - \lambda_j)\ c_{jk} + \mathrm{reg}(\lambda - \lambda_j)$$

□

Next, we introduce the "γ deformed" series corresponding to ${}_\gamma\vec{\Psi}_k$. For $\gamma_0 > 0$ sufficiently small and $0 < \gamma < \gamma_0$, $A_1 - \gamma$ has non integer diagonal entries and A_1 no integer eigenvalues, therefore:

$$({}_\gamma\vec{\Psi}_k)^{[-q]}(\lambda) = (-1)^q \sum_{l=q}^{\infty} \Gamma(\lambda'_k - \gamma + 1 - l)\vec{f}^{\,(k)}_{l-q}\ (\lambda - \lambda_k)^{l-\lambda'_k+\gamma-1}, \qquad \forall q \geq 0$$

and in particular $({}_\gamma\vec{\Psi}_k)^{[0]}(\lambda) = {}_\gamma\vec{\Psi}_k(\lambda)$. Recall that the coefficients $\vec{f}^{\,(k)}_{l-q}$ are the same for any $\gamma \in \mathbb{C}$.

Lemma 11 *Let $0 < \gamma < \gamma_0$ be such that $(A_1 - \gamma)$ has no integer diagonal entries and no integer eigenvalues. Let $q_1, q_2 \in \mathbb{N}$. Then*

$$\boxed{\int_{\lambda_k}^{\lambda} ds\ (\lambda - s)^{q_1+\gamma-1}(\vec{\Psi}_k)^{[-q_2]}(s) = \frac{\Gamma(q_1+\gamma)\ \sin\pi(\lambda'_k-\gamma)}{\sin\pi\lambda'_k}\ ({}_\gamma\vec{\Psi}_k)^{[-q_1-q_2]}(\lambda), \qquad \lambda'_k \notin \mathbb{Z}}$$

$$\boxed{\int_{\lambda_k}^{\lambda} ds\ (\lambda - s)^{q_1+\gamma-1}(\vec{\Psi}_k)^{[-q_2]}(s) = \frac{\Gamma(q_1+\gamma)\ \sin\pi\gamma}{\pi}\ ({}_\gamma\vec{\Psi}_k)^{[-q_1-q_2]}(\lambda), \qquad \lambda'_k \in \mathbb{Z}_-}$$

The branch of $(\lambda - s)^\gamma$ in the integrals, for $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_\eta$, is given by $\eta - 2\pi < \arg(\lambda - s)|_{s=\lambda_k} < \eta$, and the continuous change along the path of integration. The integrals are well defined for $0 < \gamma < \gamma_0$, $q_1 \geq 0$ and q_2 sufficiently big.

Proof: If $\lambda'_k \notin \mathbb{Z}$ the statement is proved in [3], Lemma 2′. The same computations bring the result also for $\lambda'_k = N_k \in \mathbb{Z}_-$. It is enough to integrate expressions (46) and (47) term by term (where $|\lambda - \lambda_k|$ is small enough to make the series converge). In each term, the following integral appears

$$\int_{\lambda_k}^{\lambda} (\lambda - s)^{q_1+\gamma-1}(s - \lambda_k)^{l-\lambda'_k-1}\ ds = (*)$$

Since one can integrate along a line from λ_k to λ, we parametrize the line with parameter $x \in [0, 1]$ as follows: $s = \lambda_k + x(\lambda - \lambda_k)$. This yealds the integral representation of the Beta function $B(a, b) = \Gamma(a)\Gamma(b)/\Gamma(a + b)$. Indeed

$$(*) = (\lambda - \lambda_k)^{q_1+\gamma+l-\lambda'_k-1} \int_0^1 (1 - x)^{q_1+\gamma-1}x^{l-\lambda'_k-1}dx$$

$$= (\lambda - \lambda_k)^{q_1+\gamma+l-\lambda'_k-1}\ \frac{\Gamma(q_1 + \gamma)\Gamma(l - \lambda'_k)}{\Gamma(q_1 + \gamma + l - \lambda'_k)}$$

The formula holds for any value of λ'_k. Note that $l \geq q_2$, thus if q_1 and q_2 are big enough, the integrals converge. Note also that for $\lambda'_k = N_k \leq -1$, the integrals converge for $q_2 \geq 0$. Moreover, since we have assumed $\gamma > 0$, the integrals converge for any $q_1 \geq 0$. Finally, some manipulations using $\Gamma(x)\Gamma(1 - x) = \pi/\sin(\pi x)$, yield the result. For example, in case $\lambda'_k = N_k \leq -1$, we have

$$\int_{\lambda_k}^{\lambda} ds\ (\lambda - s)^{q_1+\gamma-1}(\vec{\Psi}_k)^{[-q_2]}(s) =$$

$$= (-1)^{q_2} \sum_{l \geq q_2} \frac{(-1)^{l-N_k}}{(l-N_k-1)!}\ \vec{f}^{\,(k)}_{l-q_2}\ (\lambda-\lambda_k)^{q_1+\gamma+l-N_k-1}\ \frac{\Gamma(q_1+\gamma)\Gamma(l-N_k)}{\Gamma(q_1+\gamma+l-N_k)} = (**)$$

We use

$$\Gamma(l-N_k) = (l-N_k-1)!\ , \qquad \frac{1}{\Gamma(q_1+\gamma+l-N_k)} = \frac{\Gamma(N_k+1-\gamma-l-q_1)\sin(q_1+l-N_k+\gamma)}{\pi}$$

and change $l \mapsto l-q_1$. We get

$$(**) = (-1)^{q_1+q_2}\frac{\Gamma(q_1+\gamma)\sin\pi\gamma}{\pi} \sum_{l\geq q_1+q_2} \Gamma(N_k-\gamma_1-l)\vec{f}^{\,(k)}_{l-q_1-q_2}\ (\lambda-\lambda_k)^{l-(N_k-\gamma)-1}$$

$$= \frac{\Gamma(q_1+\gamma)\ \sin\pi\gamma}{\pi}\ ({}_\gamma\vec{\Psi}_k)^{[-q_1-q_2]}(\lambda).$$

□

Lemma 12 *Let $0<\gamma<\gamma_0$ be such that $(A_1-\gamma)$ has no integer diagonal entries and no integer eigenvalues. Then*

$$\boxed{\int_{\lambda_k}^{\lambda} ds\ (\lambda-s)^{\gamma-1}(\hat{\Psi}_k)^{[-q]}(s) = \tfrac{\Gamma(\gamma)\ \sin\pi\gamma}{\pi}\ ({}_\gamma\vec{\Psi}_k)^{[-N_k-1-q]}(\lambda), \qquad \lambda'_k = N_k \in \mathbb{N}}$$

The integral is well defined for $0<\gamma<\gamma_0$ and $q\geq 0$ integer. The branch of $(\lambda-s)^\gamma$ is defined in the same way as in Lemma 11.

Proof: Integration term by term yields

$$(\hat{\Psi}_k)^{[-q]}(s) = (-1)^{N_k+1+q}\sum_{l\geq q}\frac{(-1)^{l+1}}{l!}\vec{f}^{\,(k)}_{l-q}(\lambda-\lambda_k)^l,$$

$$({}_\gamma\vec{\Psi}_k)^{[-N_k-1-q]}(\lambda) = (-1)^{N_k+1+q}\sum_{l\geq N_k+1+q}\Gamma(N_k-\gamma+1-l)\vec{f}^{\,(k)}_{l-N_k-1-q}\ (\lambda-\lambda_k)^{l-N_k+\gamma-1}.$$

As in the previous lemma, we compute

$$\int_{\lambda_k}^{\lambda} ds\ (\lambda-s)^{\gamma-1}(s-\lambda_k)^l = (\lambda-\lambda_k)^{\gamma+l}\ \frac{\Gamma(\gamma)\Gamma(l+1)}{\Gamma(\gamma+l+1)}$$

and use $1/\Gamma(\gamma+l+1) = (-1)^{l+1}\sin(\pi\gamma)\Gamma(-\gamma-l)/\pi$. This implies that

$$\int_{\lambda_k}^{\lambda} ds\ (\lambda-s)^{\gamma-1}(\hat{\Psi}_k)^{[-q]}(s) = (-1)^{N_k+1+q}\frac{\Gamma(\gamma)\sin\pi\gamma}{\pi}\sum_{l\geq q}\Gamma(-l-\gamma)\vec{f}^{\,(k)}_{l-q}(\lambda-\lambda_k)^{l+\gamma}.$$

After redefining $l' = l+N_k+1$ we obtain the final result. □

We establish the monodromy of $\vec{\Psi}_k^{[-q]}$ and $\hat{\Psi}_k^{[-q]}$ in the following



Figure 7: The paths of analytic continuation.

Proposition 12 *Let $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_\eta$. Let $q \geq 0$ be an integer. Let $\alpha_j = 2\pi i$ when $\lambda'_j \in \mathbb{Z}$, and $\alpha_j = e^{-2\pi i \lambda'_j} - 1$ when $\lambda'_j \notin \mathbb{Z}$. The following transformations hold for a loop γ_j around a pole λ_j.*

a) If $\lambda'_k \notin \mathbb{Z}$ or $\lambda'_k \in \mathbb{Z}_-$:

$$\vec{\Psi}_k^{[-q]}(\lambda) \longmapsto \vec{\Psi}_k^{[-q]}(\lambda) + \begin{cases} \alpha_j c_{jk}\ \vec{\Psi}_j^{[-q]}(\lambda), & \lambda'_j \notin \mathbb{Z} \text{ or } \lambda'_j \in \mathbb{Z}_- \\ \alpha_j c_{jk}\ \hat{\Psi}_j^{[-q+N_j+1]}(\lambda), & \lambda'_j \in \mathbb{N} \end{cases}$$

b) If $\lambda'_k \in \mathbb{N}$:

$$\hat{\Psi}_k^{[-q]}(\lambda) \longmapsto \hat{\Psi}_k^{[-q]}(\lambda) + \begin{cases} \alpha_j c_{jk}\ \vec{\Psi}_j^{[-q-1-N_k]}(\lambda), & \lambda'_j \notin \mathbb{Z} \text{ or } \lambda'_j \in \mathbb{Z}_- \\ \alpha_j c_{jk}\ \hat{\Psi}_j^{[-q+N_j-N_k]}(\lambda), & \lambda'_j \in \mathbb{N}, \end{cases}$$

Proof: We consider the function $\Phi_k^{[-q]}(\lambda, \lambda_0)$ defined in (51) for $\lambda,\ \lambda_0 \in \mathcal{P}_\eta$. For simplicity of notation, we omit λ_0, namely we write

$$\Phi_k^{[-q]}(\lambda) = \int_{\lambda_0}^{\lambda} d\xi_q \int_{\lambda_0}^{\xi_q} d\xi_{q-1} \cdots \int_{\lambda_0}^{\xi_2} d\xi_1\ \phi_k(\xi_1).$$

$$\Phi_k^{[-q]}(\lambda) = \phi_k(\lambda), \qquad \text{if } q = 0$$

In the cut-plane $\mathcal{P}_\eta$, we consider λ close to $\lambda_j \neq \lambda_k$ in such a way that the series representations of $(\phi_j)^{[-q]}(\lambda)$ converge. We also consider a loop γ_j around λ_j in counter-clockwise direction, represented by $(\lambda - \lambda_j) \mapsto (\lambda - \lambda_j)e^{2\pi i}$. See figure 7. We have the following transformation after the loop

$$\Phi_k^{[-q]}(\lambda) \longmapsto \Phi_k^{[-q]}(\lambda) + \oint_{\gamma_j} d\xi_q \int_{\lambda_0}^{\xi_q} d\xi_{q-1} \cdots \int_{\lambda_0}^{\xi_2} d\xi_1 \ \phi_k(\xi_1).$$

By formula (52) it follows that the analytic continuation of $(\phi_k)^{[-q]}(\lambda)$ along the loop γ_j is

$$(\phi_k)^{[-q]}(\lambda) \longmapsto (\phi_k)^{[-q]}(\lambda) + \oint_{\gamma_j} d\xi_q \int_{\lambda_0}^{\xi_q} d\xi_{q-1} \cdots \int_{\lambda_0}^{\xi_2} d\xi_1 \ \phi_k(\xi_1), \qquad \forall q \geq 0.$$

Next, we express $\phi_k(\xi_1)$ in terms of the solutions ϕ_j at λ_j. We distinguish the two cases in the lemma.

Case a): $\lambda_k' \notin \mathbb{Z}$ or $\lambda_k' \in \mathbb{Z}_-$. We have $\phi_k(\xi_1) = \vec{\Psi}_k(\xi_1)$, therefore we use (4), namely

$$\phi_k(\xi_1) = \begin{cases} \vec{\Psi}_j(\xi_1) c_{jk} + \mathrm{reg}(\xi_1 - \lambda_j), & \lambda_j' \notin \mathbb{Z} \\ \vec{\Psi}_j(\xi_1) \ln(\xi_1 - \lambda_j) \ c_{jk} + \mathrm{reg}(\xi_1 - \lambda_j), & \lambda_j' \in \mathbb{Z}_- \\ \left(\vec{\Psi}_j(\xi_1) \ln(\xi_1 - \lambda_j) + \frac{P^{(j)}(\xi_1)}{(\xi_1 - \lambda_j)^{N_j+1}} \right) c_{jk} + \mathrm{reg}(\xi_1 - \lambda_j), & \lambda_j' = N_j \in \mathbb{N} \end{cases}$$

a.1) When $\lambda_j' \notin \mathbb{Z}$, we have

$$\oint_{\gamma_j} d\xi_q \int_{\lambda_0}^{\xi_q} d\xi_{q-1} \cdots \int_{\lambda_0}^{\xi_2} d\xi_1 \ \Big(\vec{\Psi}_j(\xi_1) c_{jk} + \mathrm{reg}(\xi_1 - \lambda_j) \Big) =$$

$$= \oint_{\gamma_j} d\xi_q \ \Phi_j^{[-(q-1)]}(\xi_q) \ c_{jk} + \oint_{\gamma_j} d\xi_q \ \mathrm{reg}(\xi_q - \lambda_j) \equiv \oint_{\gamma_j} d\xi_q \ \Phi_j^{[-(q-1)]}(\xi_q) \ c_{jk} \ + 0,$$

because the loop integral of regular terms at λ_j vanishes. Now, by (53) and (52), we have

$$\oint_{\gamma_j} d\xi_q \ \Phi_j^{[-(q-1)]}(\xi_q) \ c_{jk} = c_{jk} \ \Phi_j^{[-q]}(\xi_q) \Big|_{\lambda-\lambda_j}^{(\lambda-\lambda_j)e^{2\pi i}}$$

$$\equiv c_{jk} \ \vec{\Psi}_j^{[-q]}(\xi_q) \Big|_{\lambda-\lambda_j}^{(\lambda-\lambda_j)e^{2\pi i}} = \vec{\Psi}_j^{[-q]}(\lambda)(e^{-2\pi i \lambda_j'} - 1) c_{jk}, \qquad q \geq 0$$

The last step follows from the series representation (46). This proves the Lemma in case a.1).

a.2) When $\lambda_j' \in \mathbb{Z}_-$, we use (54) and compute

$$\oint_{\gamma_j} d\xi_q \int_{\lambda_0}^{\xi_q} d\xi_{q-1} \cdots \int_{\lambda_0}^{\xi_2} d\xi_1 \Big(\vec{\Psi}_j(\xi_1) \ln(\xi_1 - \lambda_j) \ c_{jk} + \mathrm{reg}(\xi_1 - \lambda_j) \Big) =$$

$$= c_{jk} \ (\vec{\Psi})_j^{[-q]}(\xi_q) \ln(\xi_q - \lambda_j) \Big|_{\lambda-\lambda_j}^{(\lambda-\lambda_j)e^{2\pi i}} = 2\pi i c_{jk} \ (\vec{\Psi})_j^{[-q]}(\lambda), \qquad q \geq 0$$

This implies the Lemma in case a.2).

a.3) When $\lambda_j' = N_j \in \mathbb{N}$, we use (55) and compute

$$\oint_{\gamma_j} d\xi_q \int_{\lambda_0}^{\xi_q} d\xi_{q-1} \cdots \int_{\lambda_0}^{\xi_2} d\xi_1 \left[\left(\vec{\Psi}_j(\xi_1) \ln(\xi_1 - \lambda_j) + \frac{P^{(j)}(\xi_1)}{(\xi_1 - \lambda_j)^{N_j+1}} \right) c_{jk} + \mathrm{reg}(\xi_1 - \lambda_j) \right] =$$

$$= c_{jk}\ \hat{\Psi}_j^{[-q+N_j+1]}(\xi_q)\ln(\xi_q-\lambda_j)\Big|_{\lambda-\lambda_j}^{(\lambda-\lambda_j)e^{2\pi i}} = 2\pi i c_{jk}\hat{\Psi}_j^{[-q+N_j+1]}(\lambda), \qquad q \geq N_j+1$$

This proves the Lemma in case a.3).

Case b): when $\lambda'_k = N_k \in \mathbb{N}$, we need to compute

$$\oint_{\gamma_j} d\xi_q \int_{\lambda_0}^{\xi_q} d\xi_{q-1} \cdots \int_{\lambda_0}^{\xi_2} d\xi_1 \hat{\Psi}_k(\xi_1). \tag{60}$$

b.1) In the case of $\lambda'_j \notin \mathbb{Z}$, we use (56), and find

$$(60) = \oint_{\gamma_j} d\xi_q \int_{\lambda_0}^{\xi_q} d\xi_{q-1} \cdots \int_{\lambda_0}^{\xi_2} d\xi_1 \Big(\vec{\Psi}_j^{[-N_k-1]}(\xi_1)c_{jk} + \mathrm{reg}(\xi_1-\lambda_j)\Big)$$

$$= \Big(c_{jk}\vec{\Psi}_j^{[-N_k-1-q]}(\xi_q) + \mathrm{reg}(\xi_q-\lambda_j)\Big)\Big|_{(\lambda-\lambda_j)}^{e^{2\pi i}(\lambda-\lambda_j)} = c_{jk}(e^{-2\pi i\lambda'_j}-1)\vec{\Psi}_j^{[-N_k-1-q]}(\lambda).$$

b.2) In the case of $\lambda'_j \in \mathbb{N}$, we use (57) and Proposition 11, and find

$$(60) =$$

$$\oint_{\gamma_j} d\xi_q \int_{\lambda_0}^{\xi_q} d\xi_{q-1} \cdots \int_{\lambda_0}^{\xi_2} d\xi_1 \left[\left(\hat{\Psi}_j^{[N_j-N_k]}(\xi_1)\log(\xi_1-\lambda_j) + \frac{P_{N_j-N_k-1}(\xi_1)}{(\xi_1-\lambda_j)^{N_j-N_k}}\right)c_{jk} + \mathrm{reg}(\xi_1-\lambda_j)\right]$$

where $P_{N_j-N_k-1} = 0$ for $N_k \geq N_j$.
For $0 \leq q \leq N_j - N_k - 1$, the integral is

$$= \left[c_{jk}\left(\vec{\Psi}_j^{[N_j-N_k-q]}(\xi_q)\ln(\lambda-\lambda_j) + \frac{P^{(j)}_{N_j-N_k-1-q}(\xi_q)}{(\xi_q-\lambda_j)^{N_j-N_k-q}}\right) + \mathrm{reg}(\xi_q-\lambda_j)\right]\Big|_{(\lambda-\lambda_j)}^{e^{2\pi i}(\lambda-\lambda_j)}.$$

For $q \geq N_j - N_k \geq 0$, the integral is

$$= \Big[c_{jk}\vec{\Psi}_j^{[N_j-N_k-q]}(\xi_q)\ln(\xi_q-\lambda_j) + \mathrm{reg}(\xi_q-\lambda_j)\Big]\Big|_{(\lambda-\lambda_j)}^{e^{2\pi i}(\lambda-\lambda_j)}.$$

In both cases, the above expressions yield

$$(60) = 2\pi i c_{jk}\vec{\Psi}_j^{[N_j-N_k-q]}(\lambda)$$

b.3) In case $\lambda'_j \in \mathbb{Z}_-$, we use (58) and Proposition 11, and find

$$(60) = \oint_{\gamma_j} d\xi_q \int_{\lambda_0}^{\xi_q} d\xi_{q-1} \cdots \int_{\lambda_0}^{\xi_2} d\xi_1 \Big(\vec{\Psi}_j^{[-N_k-1]}(\xi_1)\ln(\xi_1-\lambda_j)c_{jk} + \mathrm{reg}(\xi_1-\lambda_j)\Big)$$

$$= \Big[\vec{\Psi}_j^{[-N_k-1-q]}(\xi_q)\ln(\xi_q-\lambda_j)\ c_{jk}\ + \mathrm{reg}(\xi_q-\lambda_j)\Big]\Big|_{(\lambda-\lambda_j)}^{e^{2\pi i}(\lambda-\lambda_j)} = 2\pi i c_{jk}\ \vec{\Psi}_j^{[-N_k-1-q]}(\lambda).$$

The above computations imply the Lemma in case b). $\square$

Proof of Proposition 10: Given a function $f(\lambda)$, $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_\eta$, we denote with $f_+(\lambda)$ the value on the left side of L_j, where $\arg(\lambda - \lambda_j) = \eta - 2\pi$. We denote with $f_-(\lambda)$ the value on the right side, where $\arg(\lambda - \lambda_j) = \eta$. By Lemmas 11 and 12 we have:

$$\left({}_\gamma\vec{\Psi}_k\right)_\pm^{[-q(\lambda'_k)]}(\lambda) = F(\lambda'_k)\left\{\int_{\lambda_k}^{\lambda_j}(\lambda-s)^{\gamma-1}\phi_k^{[-q]}(s)ds \; + \int_{\lambda_j}^{\lambda}(\lambda-s)^{\gamma-1}\left(\phi_k^{[-q]}\right)_\pm(s)ds\right\}$$

where

$$q(\lambda'_k) = \begin{cases} q & \text{if } \lambda'_k \notin \mathbb{Z} \text{ or } \lambda'_k \in \mathbb{Z}_-, \\ \\ q+N_k+1 & \text{if } \lambda'_k \in \mathbb{N}, \end{cases}$$

$$\phi_k = \begin{cases} \vec{\Psi}_k & \text{if } \lambda'_k \notin \mathbb{Z} \text{ or } \lambda'_k \in \mathbb{Z}_-, \\ \\ \hat{\Psi}_k & \text{if } \lambda'_k \in \mathbb{N}, \end{cases}$$

$$F(\lambda'_k) = \begin{cases} \frac{\sin\pi\lambda'_k}{\Gamma(\gamma)\sin\pi(\lambda'_k-\gamma)} & \text{if } \lambda'_k \notin \mathbb{Z}, \\ \\ \frac{\pi}{\Gamma(\gamma)\sin\pi\gamma} & \text{if } \lambda'_k \in \mathbb{Z}. \end{cases}$$

In the integral, $\arg(\lambda - s)$, $s \in \mathcal{P}_\eta$, has the value obtained by the continuous change along the path of integration from λ_k up to s belonging to L_j. Change from f_- to f_+ is obtained along a small loop encircling only λ_j. Therefore, Lemma 12 yields

$$\left({}_\gamma\vec{\Psi}_k\right)_-^{[-q(\lambda'_k)]}(\lambda) - \left({}_\gamma\vec{\Psi}_k\right)_+^{[-q(\lambda'_k)]}(\lambda) = \alpha_j[\gamma]c_{jk}[\gamma]\left({}_\gamma\vec{\Psi}_j\right)_+^{[-q(\lambda'_k)]}(\lambda). \tag{61}$$

By Lemmas 11 and 12 we write

$$\left({}_\gamma\vec{\Psi}_k\right)_-^{[-q(\lambda'_k)]}(\lambda) - \left({}_\gamma\vec{\Psi}_k\right)_+^{[-q(\lambda'_k)]}(\lambda) = F(\lambda'_k)\int_{\lambda_j}^{\lambda}(\lambda-s)^{\gamma-1}\left[\left(\phi_k^{[-q]}\right)_-(s) - \left(\phi_k^{[-q]}\right)_+(s)\right] \tag{62}$$

We need to distinguish two cases.

1) $\lambda'_k \notin \mathbb{Z}$, or $\lambda'_k \in \mathbb{Z}_-$. In this case (61), (62) and Lemma 12 applied to the integrand yield the following equalities.

1.a) for $\lambda'_j \notin \mathbb{Z}$ or $\lambda'_j \in \mathbb{Z}_-$:

$$\alpha_j[\gamma]c_{jk}[\gamma]\left({}_\gamma\vec{\Psi}_j\right)_+^{[-q]}(\lambda) = F(\lambda'_k)\int_{\lambda_j}^{\lambda}ds\;(\lambda-s)^{\gamma-1}\alpha_j c_{jk}\left(\vec{\Psi}_j\right)_+^{[-q]}(s), \tag{63}$$

1.b) for $\lambda'_j \in \mathbb{N}$:

$$\alpha_j[\gamma]c_{jk}[\gamma]\left({}_\gamma\vec{\Psi}_j\right)_+^{[-q]}(\lambda) = F(\lambda'_k)\int_{\lambda_j}^{\lambda}ds\;(\lambda-s)^{\gamma-1}\alpha_j c_{jk}\left(\hat{\Psi}_j\right)_+^{[-q+N_j+1]}(s), \tag{64}$$



Figure 8: The figure shows $\arg(\lambda - s)$ as $s \to \lambda_j$.

We apply again Lemmas (11) and (12) to express the r.h.s. of the above equalities. To this end, we need $(\lambda - s)_+$ in the integrand. Observe that

$$(\lambda - s)^{\gamma-1} \text{ in the integrand } = \begin{cases} (\lambda - s)_-^{\gamma-1} = \left[e^{2\pi i}(\lambda - s)_+\right]^{\gamma-1} & \text{when } k \succ j \\ (\lambda - s)_+^{\gamma-1} & \text{when } k \prec j. \end{cases}$$

Indeed, when λ belongs to the left side of L_j and $s \in \mathcal{P}_\eta$, then $\eta - 2\pi < \arg(\lambda - s) < \eta$. When s reaches L_j from the left, then $\arg(\lambda - s) \to \eta$ if L_k is to the left of L_j, namely $k \succ j$: in this case we obtain $(\lambda - s)_-$. On the other hand, $\arg(\lambda - s) \to \eta - 2\pi$ if L_k is to the right of L_j, namely $k \prec j$: in this case we obtain $(\lambda - s)_+$. See figure 8. Applying Lemmas (11) and (12) we find

$$\text{r.h.s. of (63) and (64) } = \begin{cases} \frac{F(\lambda'_k)}{F(\lambda'_j)} e^{2\pi i\gamma} \alpha_j c_{jk} \left(\gamma \vec{\Psi}_j\right)_+^{[-q]}(\lambda) & k \succ j, \\ \frac{F(\lambda'_k)}{F(\lambda'_j)} \alpha_j c_{jk} \left(\gamma \vec{\Psi}_j\right)_+^{[-q]}(\lambda) & k \prec j. \end{cases}$$

Namely:

$$\alpha_j[\gamma] c_{jk}[\gamma] = \begin{cases} \frac{F(\lambda'_k)}{F(\lambda'_j)} e^{2\pi i\gamma} \alpha_j c_{jk} & k \succ j, \\ \frac{F(\lambda'_k)}{F(\lambda'_j)} \alpha_j c_{jk} & k \prec j. \end{cases} \tag{65}$$

Finally, we compute the ratio $F(\lambda'_k)/F(\lambda'_j)$. For $\lambda'_j \notin \mathbb{Z}$:

$$\frac{F(\lambda'_k)}{F(\lambda'_j)} = \frac{\sin \pi\lambda'_k \ \sin \pi(\lambda'_j - \gamma)}{\sin \pi\lambda'_j \ \sin \pi(\lambda'_k - \gamma)} = \frac{(1 - e^{-2\pi i\lambda'_k})(1 - e^{-2\pi i(\lambda'_j - \gamma)})}{(1 - e^{-2\pi i\lambda'_j})(1 - e^{-2\pi i(\lambda'_k - \gamma)})} = \frac{\alpha_k \alpha_j[\gamma]}{\alpha_j \alpha_k[\gamma]}.$$

For $\lambda'_j \in \mathbb{Z}$:

$$\frac{F(\lambda'_k)}{F(\lambda'_j)} = \frac{\sin \pi\gamma \ \sin \pi\lambda'_k}{\pi \ \sin \pi(\lambda'_k - \gamma)} = \frac{e^{2\pi i\gamma} - 1}{2\pi i} \frac{e^{-2\pi i\lambda'_k} - 1}{e^{-2\pi i(\lambda'_k - \gamma)} - 1} = \frac{\alpha_j[\gamma]}{\alpha_j} \frac{\alpha_k}{\alpha_k[\gamma]}$$

where we have used the fact that $\alpha_j = 2\pi i$ and $\alpha_j[\gamma] = e^{2\pi i\gamma} - 1$.
The above computations imply the statement of Proposition 10 when $\lambda'_k \notin \mathbb{Z}$ and $\lambda'_k \in \mathbb{Z}_-$.

2) $\lambda'_k \in \mathbb{N}$. In this case (61), (62) and Lemma 12 applied to the integrand yield the following equalities.

2.a) for $\lambda'_j \notin \mathbb{Z}$ or $\lambda'_j \in \mathbb{Z}_-$:

$$\alpha_j[\gamma]c_{jk}[\gamma]\left({}_\gamma\vec{\Psi}_j\right)_+^{[-q-N_k-1]}(\lambda) = F(\lambda'_k)\int_{\lambda_j}^{\lambda} ds\ (\lambda-s)^{\gamma-1}\alpha_j c_{jk}\left(\vec{\Psi}_j\right)_+^{[-q-N_k-1]}(s) \tag{66}$$

2.b) for $\lambda'_j \in \mathbb{N}$:

$$\alpha_j[\gamma]c_{jk}[\gamma]\left({}_\gamma\vec{\Psi}_j\right)_+^{[-q-N_k-1]}(\lambda) = F(\lambda'_k)\int_{\lambda_j}^{\lambda} ds\ (\lambda-s)^{\gamma-1}\alpha_j c_{jk}\left(\hat{\Psi}_j\right)_+^{[-q-N_k-1+N_j+1]}(s). \tag{67}$$

We apply again Lemmas (11) and (12) to express the r.h.s. of the above equalities, keeping into account the branch of $(\lambda-s)^{\gamma-1}$ as before. We find

$$\text{r.h.s. of (66) and (67)} = \begin{cases} \frac{F(\lambda'_k)}{F(\lambda'_j)}e^{2\pi i\gamma}\alpha_j c_{jk}\left({}_\gamma\vec{\Psi}_j\right)_+^{[-q-N_k-1]}(\lambda) & k \succ j, \\ \frac{F(\lambda'_k)}{F(\lambda'_j)}\alpha_j c_{jk}\left({}_\gamma\vec{\Psi}_j\right)_+^{[-q-N_k-1]}(\lambda) & k \prec j. \end{cases}$$

Namely, we obtain again

$$\alpha_j[\gamma]c_{jk}[\gamma] = \begin{cases} \frac{F(\lambda'_k)}{F(\lambda'_j)}e^{2\pi i\gamma}\alpha_j c_{jk} & k \succ j, \\ \frac{F(\lambda'_k)}{F(\lambda'_j)}\alpha_j c_{jk} & k \prec j. \end{cases} \tag{68}$$

Finally, we compute the ratio $F(\lambda'_k)/F(\lambda'_j)$. For $\lambda'_j \notin \mathbb{Z}$:

$$\frac{F(\lambda'_k)}{F(\lambda'_j)} = \frac{\pi}{\sin\pi\gamma}\frac{\sin\pi(\lambda'_j-1)}{\sin\pi\lambda'_j} = \frac{2\pi i}{e^{2\pi i\gamma}-1}\frac{e^{-2\pi i(\lambda'_j-\gamma)}-1}{e^{-2\pi i\lambda'_j}-1} = \frac{\alpha_k}{\alpha_k[\gamma]}\frac{\alpha_j[\gamma]}{\alpha_j}$$

where we have used the fact that $\alpha_k = 2\pi i$ and $\alpha_k[\gamma] = e^{2\pi i\gamma} - 1$.
For $\lambda'_j \in \mathbb{Z}$:

$$\frac{F(\lambda'_k)}{F(\lambda'_j)} = 1$$

In this last case, observe that $\alpha_k = \alpha_j = 2\pi i$ and $\alpha_k[\gamma] = \alpha_j[\gamma] = e^{2\pi i\gamma} - 1$.
The above computations imply the statement of Proposition 10 when $\lambda'_k \in \mathbb{N}$. □

8 Appendix

Some statements of the main body of the paper are proved in [3] with the *assumption (i)* of [3], namely $\lambda'_1, ..., \lambda'_n$ not integers. Here we prove the statements without assumptions on A_1.

Proof of Proposition 1: It goes as the proof of Proposition 1 in [3], which was done assuming no integer λ_k''s, $k = 1, ..., n$. We repeat the proof with no assumptions on the λ_k''s. For the proof, recall Remark 1 and Lemma 2.

Vector solutions of the equation (2) form a n dimensional linear space. In Section 2 we have proved that for any $j = 1, ..., n$, the vector solutions regular at one λ_j form a linear space V_j of dimension $\dim V_j \geq n - 1$. Now, choose a λ_k. The number of independent solutions which are regular at each of the $n - 1$ poles $\lambda_j \neq \lambda_k$ is equal to $\dim(\cap_{j\neq k} V_j) \geq 1$. Therefore, there exist at least one vector solutions $\vec{\Psi}_k^*(\lambda)$, analytic at all $\lambda_j \neq \lambda_k$, $1 \leq j \leq n$, $j \neq k$.

If $\dim(\cap_{j\neq k} V_j) > 1$, then there must exist a polynomial solution of (2). Indeed, suppose that $\dim(\cap_{j\neq k} V_j) > 1$. So there are at least two independent solutions, regular at each $\lambda_j \neq \lambda_k$. Let them be $\vec{\psi}_1(\lambda)$ and $\vec{\psi}_2(\lambda)$. At λ_k they must have representation $\vec{\psi}_q = c_q\ \vec{\Psi}_k^{(sing)} + \mathrm{reg}_q(\lambda - \lambda_k)$, $q = 1, 2$, $c_q \in \mathbb{C}\backslash\{0\}$. But now, $c_1^{-1}\vec{\psi}_1 - c_2^{-1}\vec{\psi}_2$ is not vanishing (by independence of the two solutions) and is analytic also at $\lambda = \lambda_k$. It follows that there is an analytic solution at each λ_i, $1 \leq i \leq n$, which therefore must be polynomial (Remark 1). This can occur if and only if A_1 has at least one negative integer eigenvalue (Lemma 2). Thus, if we assume that A_1 has no negative integer eigenvalues, so that there are no polynomial solutions, then $\dim(\cap_{j\neq k} V_j) = 1$. Therefore, for any k there exists a unique (up to normalization) solution which is regular at all $\lambda_j \neq \lambda_k$ and *must be singular* at λ_k. It is the unique $\vec{\Psi}_k^*$ with normalization (16). Obviously, $\vec{\Psi}_1^*, ..., \vec{\Psi}_n^*$ are independent. In particular, observe that if $\lambda_k' \in -\mathbb{N} - 2$, necessarily the log-singular solution must exist (i.e. $\vec{\Psi}_k^{(sing)} \neq 0$).

Conversely, if $\vec{\Psi}_1^*(\lambda), ..., \vec{\Psi}_n^*(\lambda)$ exist satisfying (15) and (16), then they are independent, because $\sum_{l=1}^n c_l \vec{\Psi}_l^*(\lambda) = 0$ holds when $\lambda \to \lambda_i$, $\forall i = 1, ..., n$, only if $c_i = 0$. Moreover, $\sum_{l=1}^n c_l \vec{\Psi}_l^*(\lambda)$ is analytic at all $\lambda_j \neq \lambda_k$ for a chosen k, only if $c_j = 0$ for all $j \neq k$. Therefore, there is only one solution analytic at all $\lambda_j \neq \lambda_k$, which is a multiple of $\vec{\Psi}_k^*(\lambda)$. In other words, the space $\cap_{j\neq k} V_j$ of solutions regular at all $\lambda_j \neq \lambda_k$ is one dimensional, thus there are no polynomial solutions and A_1 cannot have a negative integer eigenvalue.

To prove the last assertion, write $\Psi(\lambda) = \Psi^*(\lambda)\tilde{C}$. Thus $\vec{\Psi}_k(\lambda) = \vec{\Psi}_k^*(\lambda)\tilde{C}_{kk} + \sum_{j\neq k} \vec{\Psi}_j^*(\lambda)\tilde{C}_{jk}$. Now, consider the behaviours at $\lambda = \lambda_k$ of l.h.s. and r.h.s. By (12), (15) and (16) we conclude that $\tilde{C}_{kk} = 1$ in case $\lambda_k' \notin \mathbb{Z}$, and $\tilde{C}_{kk} = 0$ in cases $\lambda_k' \in \mathbb{Z}$. Thus $\tilde{C}_{kk} = c_{kk}$. Now consider the behaviours at $\lambda = \lambda_j$, $j \neq k$, of l.h.s. and r.h.s. By (4), (15) and (16) we obtain $\tilde{C}_{jk} = c_{jk}$. □

Proof of Proposition 5: i) is immediate, because if λ_k is accessible and $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_\eta \cap \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\eta}}$, then $\vec{\Psi}_k^{(k)}(\lambda, \eta)$ and $\vec{\Psi}_k^{(k)}(\lambda, \tilde{\eta})$ are the same branch. The same holds for the solutions $\vec{\Psi}_k$.

ii) and iii) are proved noticing that $\lambda_1, ..., \lambda_n$ are all accessible from $\mathcal{P}_\eta \cap \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\eta}}$, therefore i) holds for any k. Thus $C(\eta) = C(\tilde{\eta})$. From Proposition 1 we see that Ψ^* is uniquely defined starting from the $\vec{\Psi}_k$'s and C. □

Proof of Proposition 6: The proof follows that of Proposition 4 of [3], here generalized to the general case when $\lambda_1', ..., \lambda_k'$ are any complex numbers.

Choose a λ_k. In the plane $\mathcal{P}_\eta$ add the cut $\arg(\lambda - \lambda_k) = \tilde{\eta}$. Pet $\Pi_{\eta,\tilde{\eta}}^k$ be the connected region given by the reference points relative to these cuts, namely all points satisfying both conditions $\eta - 2\pi < \arg(\lambda - \lambda_j) < \eta$, $\forall j = 1, .., n$, and $\tilde{\eta} - 2\pi < \arg(\lambda - \lambda_k) < \tilde{\eta}$. See figure 9. We have



Figure 9: The connected region $\Pi^k_{\eta,\tilde{\eta}}$

then a relation between fundamental matrices

$$\vec{\Psi}^*_k(\lambda,\tilde{\eta}) = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \vec{\Psi}^*_j(\lambda,\eta)\ W_{jk}, \qquad \lambda \in \Pi^k_{\eta,\tilde{\eta}}.$$

– If λ_j is accessible and $j \neq k$, then $W_{jk} = 0$, because $\vec{\Psi}^*_j(\lambda,\eta)$ is singular at λ_j and $\vec{\Psi}^*_k(\lambda,\tilde{\eta})$ is not. Both are the same branch.
– At λ_k, both $\vec{\Psi}^*_k(\lambda,\tilde{\eta})$ and $\vec{\Psi}^*_k(\lambda,\tilde{\eta})$ have the same singular behavior with the same branch of logarithm (Proposition 1), therefore $\vec{\Psi}^*_k(\lambda,\tilde{\eta}) = \vec{\Psi}^*_k(\lambda,\tilde{\eta})+\mathrm{reg}(\lambda-\lambda_k)$. This implies $W_{kk} = 1$. Thus

$$\vec{\Psi}^*_k(\lambda,\tilde{\eta}) = \vec{\Psi}^*_k(\lambda,\eta) + \sum_{j\ not\ acc.} \vec{\Psi}^*_j(\lambda,\eta)\ W_{jk}, \qquad \lambda \in \Pi^k_{\eta,\tilde{\eta}}. \tag{69}$$

where the sum is on indexes of non accessible points.
– If λ_j is not accessible, in order to access it and evaluate the behaviour of l.h.s. and r.h.s. of (69), we need to analytically continue the r.h.s beyond the cut $\arg(\lambda-\lambda_k) = \eta$, crossing it in anticlockwise direction. The l.h.s is already defined beyond this cut. Also, all $\vec{\Psi}^*_j(\lambda,\eta)$ for λ_j not accessible are already defined beyond this cut. Therefore, after crossing the cut, only $\vec{\Psi}^*_k(\lambda,\eta)$ is analytically continued by M^*_k, according to Proposition 2, and (69) becomes

$$\vec{\Psi}^*_k(\lambda,\tilde{\eta}) = m_{kk}\vec{\Psi}^*_k(\lambda,\eta) + \alpha_k \sum_{j\neq k} c_{jk}\vec{\Psi}^*_j(\lambda,\eta) + \sum_{j\ not\ acc.} \vec{\Psi}^*_j(\lambda,\eta)\ W_{jk}$$

Since the l.h.s is not singular at inaccessible points, we conclude that $W_{jk} = -\alpha_k c_{jk}$, for any inaccessible λ_j. Finally, we note that the inaccessible points are those such that $\arg(\lambda_j - \lambda_k) = \eta_\nu$. We also see that $j \succ k$ w.r.t η.

The same argument is repeated for any k.

As for W_ν^{-1}, the argument does not change, but this time C and M_k^* are referred to $\tilde{\eta}$. □

Proof of Lemma 4: If we write λ_η if $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_\eta$. Then

$$\lambda_\eta - \lambda_k = (\lambda_{\eta-2\pi} - \lambda_k)e^{2\pi i}$$

It follows from the definition of Ψ that, whatever the values $\lambda'_1, ..., \lambda'_n$ are, we have

$$\Psi(\lambda, \eta - 2\pi) = \Psi(\lambda, \eta)e^{2\pi i \Lambda'}.$$

on the universal covering of $\mathbb{C}\backslash\{\lambda_1, ..., \lambda_n\}$. From the above and the connection relations we have

$$\vec{\Psi}_k(\lambda, \eta) = \vec{\Psi}_j^{(sing)}(\lambda, \eta)\ c_{jk}(\eta) + \mathrm{reg}(\lambda - \lambda_j),$$

and

$$\vec{\Psi}_k(\lambda, \eta) = e^{-2\pi i \lambda'_k}\vec{\Psi}_k(\lambda, \eta - 2\pi) =$$

$$= e^{-2\pi i \lambda'_k}\ \vec{\Psi}_j^{(sing)}(\lambda, \eta - 2\pi)\ c_{jk}(\eta - 2\pi) + \mathrm{reg}(\lambda - \lambda_j),$$

Now we use the fact that $\vec{\Psi}_j^{(sing)}(\lambda, \eta - 2\pi) = \vec{\Psi}_j(\lambda, \eta - 2\pi)$ when $\lambda'_j \notin \mathbb{Z}$, and when $\lambda'_j \in \{-1\} \cup \mathbb{N}$ we have

$$\vec{\Psi}_j^{(j)}(\lambda, \eta - 2\pi) = \vec{\Psi}_j(\lambda, \eta - 2\pi)\left[\ln(\lambda_{\eta-2\pi} - \lambda_j) + \frac{P_{N_j}^{(j)}(\lambda_{\eta-2\pi})}{(\lambda - \lambda_j)^{N_j+1}}\right] + \mathrm{reg}(\lambda_{\eta-2\pi} - \lambda_j)$$

$$= e^{2\pi i \lambda'_j}\vec{\Psi}_j(\lambda, \eta)\left\{[\ln(\lambda_\eta - \lambda_j) - 2\pi i] + \frac{P_{N_j}^{(j)}(\lambda_\eta)}{(\lambda - \lambda_j)^{N_j+1}}\right\} + \mathrm{reg}(\lambda_\eta - \lambda_j)$$

$$= e^{2\pi i \lambda'_j}\vec{\Psi}_j^{(sing)}(\lambda, \eta) + \mathrm{reg}(\lambda - \lambda_j).$$

The last step is due to the fact that $\vec{\Psi}_j(\lambda, \eta)$ is analytic at λ_j (note that $e^{2\pi i \lambda'_j} = 1$) and is absorbed into $\mathrm{reg}(\lambda - \lambda_j)$. Therefore, in all cases we have (in full generality, taking $P_{N_j}^{(j)} \equiv 0$ when $\lambda'_j \in \mathbb{Z}_-$):

$$\vec{\Psi}_j^{(sing)}(\lambda, \eta)\ c_{jk}(\eta) + \mathrm{reg}(\lambda - \lambda_j) = e^{2\pi i(\lambda'_j - \lambda'_k)}\ \vec{\Psi}_j^{(sing)}(\lambda, \eta)\ c_{jk}(\eta - 2\pi) + \mathrm{reg}(\lambda - \lambda_j).$$

Finally, since $\vec{\Psi}_j^{(sing)}(\lambda, \eta)$ is singular at λ_j, the statement of the lemma follows. □

Proof of Proposition 7: Compared to [3], we only need to consider more general monodromy matrices. Relation (22) is

$$\vec{\Psi}_k^*(\lambda, \eta - \pi) = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \vec{\Psi}_j^*(\lambda, \eta)C_{jk}^+, \quad \lambda \in \Pi_{\eta,\eta-\pi}^k$$



Figure 10: The connected region $\Pi^k_{\eta,\eta-\pi}$, branch cuts at angle η and one branch cut at angle $\eta-\pi$ at λ_k

See proof of Proposition 6 for the definition of $\Pi^k_{\eta,\eta-\pi}$. See also figure 10.

- If $\lambda_j \neq \lambda_k$ is accessible, it means that $j \succ k$. At λ_j, $\vec{\Psi}^*_j(\lambda,\eta)$ is singular, while $\vec{\Psi}^*_k(\lambda,\eta-\pi)$ is not. Both have the same branch of $\ln(\lambda-\lambda_j)$, so we must conclude that $C^+_{jk}=0$.

- At λ_k, $\vec{\Psi}^*_k(\lambda,\eta)$ and $\vec{\Psi}^*_k(\lambda,\eta-\pi)$ are both singular with the same branch of $\ln(\lambda-\lambda_k)$, so we must conclude that $C^+_{kk}=1$.

- If $\lambda_j \neq \lambda_k$ is not accessible, it means that $j \prec k$. The l.h.s. is define also at λ_j, while the r.h.s. needs analytic continuation in order to reach λ_j. The continuation is given by $\Psi^*(\lambda,\eta)\mapsto\Psi^*(\lambda,\eta)(M^*_k(\eta))^{-1}$. therefore

$$\vec{\Psi}^*_k(\lambda,\eta-\pi)=\vec{\Psi}^*_k(\lambda,\eta)e^{2\pi i\lambda'_k}+\sum_{l\neq k}\beta_k c_{lk}(\eta)\ \vec{\Psi}^*_l(\lambda,\eta)+\sum_{j\ not\ access.}\vec{\Psi}^*_j(\lambda,\eta)C^+_{jk}.$$

Since $\vec{\Psi}^*_k(\lambda,\eta-\pi)$ is not singular at a non accessible λ_j , while $\vec{\Psi}^*_l(\lambda,\eta)$ is, we conclude that $C^+_{jk}+\beta_k c_{jk}(\eta)=0$.

The same reasoning is repeated for (23). This time the monodromy which gives analytic continuation is $M^*_k(\eta-2\pi)$. Thus, we obtain that $C^-_{jk}=-\alpha_k c_{jk}(\eta-2\pi)$ when $j\succ k$ (non accessible case), $C^-_{jk}=0$ for $j\prec k$ (accessible case) and $C^-_{kk}=1$. Then, we use Lemma 4. □

References

[1] W. Balser: *Birkhoff's reduction Problem*. Russian Math. Surveys 59:6 (2004), 1047-1059.

[2] W.Balser, W.B.Jurkat, D.A.Lutz: *Birkhoff Invariants and Stokes' Multipliers for Meromorphic Linear Differential Equations*, Journal Math. Analysis and Applications, **71**, (1979), 48-94.

[3] W. Balser, W. B. Jurkat, D. A. Lutz: *On the reduction of connection problems for differential equations with an irregular singular point to ones with only regular singularities, I*, SIAM J. Math. Anal. Vol 12, No 5, (1981), 691-721.

[4] G. D. Birkhoff: *Singular points of ordinary linear differential equations*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 10 (1909), 436-470.

[5] G. Doetsch: *Introduction to the Theory and Application of the Laplace Transformation.* Springer (1974)

[6] B.Dubrovin: *Geometry of 2D topological field theories*, Lecture Notes in Math, **1620**, (1996), 120-348.

[7] B.Dubrovin: *Painlevé trascendents in two-dimensional topological field theory*, in "The Painlevé Property, One Century later" edited by R.Conte, Springer (1999).

[8] B.Dubrovin: *On almost duality for Frobenius manifolds*, in Geometry, Topology, and Mathematical Physics, Amer. Math. Soc. Transl. Ser. 2, (2004), 75-132. arXiv: math/0307374v2 (2004).

[9] S. Galkin, V. Golyshev, H. Iritani: *Gamma Classes and Quantum Cohomology of Fano Manifolds: Gamma Conjectures.* arXiv: 1404.6407 [math.AG] (2014)

[10] E.L. Ince: *Ordinary differential equations.* Dover, (1956).

[11] M. Loday-Richaud, P. Remy: *Resurgence, Stokes phenomenon and alien derivatives for level-one linear differential systems.* J. Differential Equations 250, (2011), 1591-1630.

[12] M. Mazzocco: *Painlevé sixth equation as isomonodromy deformations equations of an irregular system*, in: The Kowalewski property, CRM Proceedings and Lecture Notes 32:221240 (2002).

[13] W. Wasow: *Asymptotic Expansions for Ordinary Differential Equations*, Dover